

Please note, these transcripts are not individually reviewed and approved for accuracy.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY  
CALIFORNIA INTEGRATED WASTE MANAGEMENT BOARD  
DIVERSION, PLANNING AND LOCAL ASSISTANCE COMMITTEE

JOE SERNA JR., CAL EPA BUILDING  
COASTAL HEARING ROOM  
1001 I STREET, SECOND FLOOR  
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA

TUESDAY, MAY 7, 2002

9:09 A.M.

Doris M. Bailey, CSR, RPR, CRR  
Certified Shorthand Reporter  
License Number 8751

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION (916) 362-2345

A P P E A R A N C E S

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

STEVEN R. JONES, CHAIR  
DAN EATON  
JOSE MEDINA  
LINDA MOULTON-PATTERSON

STAFF PRESENT:

MARK LEARY, Executive Director  
ELLIOT BLOCK, Chief Legal Counsel  
JEANNINE BAKULICH, Committee Secretary  
LILAH SAMPAIO, Board Staff

--oOo--

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION (916) 362-2345

## I N D E X

	PAGE
Agenda Item A	2
Agenda Item E	116
Agenda Item F	7
Agenda Item G	23
Motion	25
Agenda Item H	26
Motion	27
Agenda Item I	27
Motion	30
Agenda Item J	32
Motion	39
Agenda Item K	39
Motion	42
Agenda Item L	46
Motion	52
Agenda Item M	52
Motion	57
Agenda Item N	57
Motion	59
Agenda Item O	60
Motion	62
Agenda Item P	63
Motion	66
Agenda Item Q	67
Motion	70
Agenda Item R	70
Motion	72
Agenda Item S	73
Motion	75

## I N D E X

	PAGE
Agenda Item T	75
Motion	78
Agenda Item U	79
Motion	80
Agenda Item V	81
Motion	84
Agenda Item W	85
Motion	88
Agenda Item X	88
Motion	89
Agenda Item Y	90
Motion	92
Agenda Item Z	92
Motion	94
Agenda Item AA	95
Motion	100
Agenda Item AB	101
Motion	104
Agenda Item AC	104
Motion	107
Agenda Item AE	108
Motion	110
Agenda Item AF	111
Motion	113
Agenda Item AG	113
Motion	115
Certificate of Certified Shorthand Reporter	125

--oOo--

## P R O C E E D I N G S

--oOo---

COMMITTEE CHAIR JONES: I'm going to call the  
May 7th committee meeting of the Diversion, Planning and  
Local Assistance to order.

Could you call the roll?

BOARD SECRETARY VILLA: Eaton?

BOARD MEMBER EATON: Here.

BOARD SECRETARY VILLA: Medina?

BOARD MEMBER MEDINA: Here.

BOARD SECRETARY VILLA: Moulton-Patterson?

COMMITTEE MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: Here.

BOARD SECRETARY VILLA: Jones?

BOARD CHAIR JONES: Here.

If anybody has got any cell phones -- I forgot  
to do this yesterday and they kept going off. If  
anybody has any cell phones, please turn 'em off during  
the meeting.

If anybody wants to speak to an item, there are  
speaker slips on the back table, bring 'em up to  
Jeannine Bakulich and she'll get 'em to me and we'll  
take care of it.

Any members have ex-parte? Mr. Eaton?

COMMITTEE MEMBER EATON: I'm up to date, thank  
you.

1 COMMITTEE CHAIR JONES: Chair Moulton-  
2 Patterson?

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: I'm up to  
4 date.

5 COMMITTEE CHAIR JONES: Mr. Medina?

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER MEDINA: None to report.

7 COMMITTEE CHAIR JONES: And I don't have any to  
8 report.

9 First item is going to be Mr. Schiavo's Deputy  
10 Director's report.

11 Just so people know, item 37, which is E on our  
12 agenda which is the status of grants under the state  
13 agency and large state facility recycling grant program,  
14 that will be the last item heard at this meeting today.

15 Mr. Schiavo.

16 MR. SCHIAVO: Yes, good morning, committee  
17 members. I'm Pat Schiavo of the Diversion, Planning and  
18 Local Assistance.

19 And I'd first like to go over some, just  
20 information that's taken place over the last month.

21 Regarding the status of the biennial reviews,  
22 as of today we'll have heard 94 biennial reviews  
23 regarding local jurisdictions. And we've also heard 16  
24 SP 1066 petitions. Next month we anticipate there will  
25 be quite a few additional SB 1066 petitions heard by the

1 Board.

2           Regarding AB 75, the state agency program,  
3 April 1st was the deadline for submittal of the first  
4 annual reports as required by statute. As of last month  
5 we had 292 agencies that submitted the report, we now  
6 have 345 agencies, so we've got a big increase.

7           There's 58 additional state agencies that are  
8 in the process of completing their reports, and then  
9 there's an additional 37 or eight that don't appear that  
10 they've made any progress at all. So we're continuing  
11 to pursue those, we're making direct telephone calls.

12           Regarding the implementation of SB 2202, you'll  
13 be hearing a report this morning regarding one of the  
14 first products of that, and that will be the accuracy  
15 indicators.

16           Regarding the U.S. EPA conference, on May 1st  
17 there was fifteen downloadable sites available for a  
18 video conference sponsored by U.S. EPA and the title of  
19 the conference was, "Communities, Setting Trends in  
20 Waste Prevention and Recycling."

21           At the Sacramento site we had fifty attendees,  
22 and in Long Beach I understand we had about twenty, and  
23 then I'm not sure what the numbers were at the other  
24 thirteen sites, but that appears to be a success.

25           Regarding our public venues effort, we've

1 commenced a survey process looking at what the status is  
2 of a number of public venues in the state, you know, 120  
3 or so. We've received a response rate back so far of  
4 about 20 percent. We're now making direct phone calls  
5 to try to up the numbers.

6           Once we see what that is we're going to try to  
7 input the information into a database and look up how to  
8 pursue implementation of some large public venues in the  
9 future and what is the status is of the current ones, as  
10 well as what success stories lie out in the field.

11           So that concludes my report. We're ready to  
12 proceed.

13           COMMITTEE CHAIR JONES: Okay. Mr. Schiavo,  
14 I've just got one suggestion. We've got a lot of SB  
15 1066 requests coming forward in the next couple of  
16 months.

17           I know Mr. Eaton had made a comment one time  
18 about, some ideas about packaging it. Could you, in the  
19 time between now and the next committee meeting, spend  
20 time with each of the Board members on this committee,  
21 at least on this committee, and you can talk to the  
22 other members, to see what their ideas might be about  
23 packaging some of these things?

24           MR. SCHIAVO: Sure.

25           COMMITTEE CHAIR JONES: And would that be okay

1 with the members? Okay. All right.

2 Mr. Schiavo, we're going to hear, well we've  
3 got our first, our first item was going to be Escalon,  
4 but I understand they have submitted their paperwork?

5 MR. SCHIAVO: Right, Escalon has as well as the  
6 city of Clayton submitted their paperwork late  
7 yesterday.

8 COMMITTEE CHAIR JONES: Okay.

9 MR. SCHIAVO: So we'd like to pull these items.

10 COMMITTEE CHAIR JONES: Okay. So you're being  
11 generous because these two items were ready to go on a  
12 compliance order because they failed to submit.

13 MR. SCHIAVO: Right.

14 COMMITTEE CHAIR JONES: And that's fine. If  
15 you got the stuff in time then we'll pull those two  
16 items.

17 MR. SCHIAVO: Yeah, the due dates of the  
18 compliance orders were for the 14th and 15th.

19 COMMITTEE CHAIR JONES: Okay. So item -- I'm  
20 sorry.

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER EATON: So are we pulling or  
22 are we going to continue it to next month as regards,  
23 because there are notice requirements with compliance  
24 orders are there not, different requirements?

25 MR. SCHIAVO: This was the --

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER EATON: I'm just asking  
2 procedural. But we're going to continue it to next  
3 month or are we going to have to re-notice it?

4 MR. SCHIAVO: I believe they met the  
5 requirements of this thirty day, and then there's  
6 another thirty day that would follow if they did not  
7 meet this per SB 2202.

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER EATON: Thank you.

9 COMMITTEE CHAIR JONES: Okay, Mr. Schiavo.  
10 Item number 38.

11 MR. SCHIAVO: Item number 38 is a discussion  
12 and request for direction on the Board approved SB 2202  
13 work plan recommendation on jurisdiction diversion rate  
14 accuracy indicators.

15 And this will be presented by Tim Hall and Nick  
16 Cavagnaro.

17 MR. CAVAGNARO: Good morning, my name is  
18 Nicholas Cavagnaro, and I work in the waste analysis  
19 branch.

20 There has been extensive Board and public  
21 review of the diversion rate measurement system as  
22 summarized on this next background slide.

23 This presentation asked for direction regarding  
24 implementation of the Senate Bill 2202 report  
25 recommendation on diversion rate accuracy indicators.

1           The report recommendation is, add a standard  
2 table of circumstances that may decrease diversion rate  
3 estimate accuracy to annual reports and biennial review  
4 agenda items.

5           The working groups suggested many accuracy  
6 indicators. We currently have data for fifteen.

7           Before discussing the fifteen indicators for  
8 which we have data, some of the key issues related to  
9 this new tool we call indicators should be covered.

10          First, indicators is not conclusive. It will  
11 not answer the question, "What is the accuracy of my  
12 diversion rate?"

13          Indicators does give caution signals when a  
14 diversion rate estimate may be inaccurate.

15          Second, jurisdictions are allowed to submit  
16 other accuracy indicators with their annual reports.  
17 Data for many of the indicators proposed by the working  
18 group members is not readily available for every  
19 jurisdiction; however, if a jurisdiction has information  
20 they think would indicate the accuracy of their  
21 diversion rate, it is encouraged to submit that  
22 information.

23          The Office of Local Assistance staff include  
24 this information in biennial review agenda items.

25          COMMITTEE CHAIR JONES: Hold on a minute, I

1 think some people over there can't hear you.

2 MR. CAVAGNARO: Can you hear me? Okay.

3 Finally, program implementation information should be  
4 used in partnership with indicators data. Indicators  
5 helps balance diversion rate estimate with diversion  
6 program information.

7 The bottom line is, please remember that these  
8 indicators are caution signals, not conclusions about  
9 diversion rate accuracy.

10 And now Tim Hall will discuss the fifteen  
11 indicators.

12 MR. HALL: Good morning, Tim Hall with waste  
13 analysis branch.

14 The first section of indicators focuses on  
15 basic jurisdiction characteristics. Because many  
16 jurisdictions that meet statutory definitions of rural  
17 are small, and small jurisdictions tend to have accuracy  
18 issues, many rural jurisdictions tend to have accuracy  
19 issues.

20 The Board's SB 2202 report to the legislature  
21 recommends new regulations that would allow rural  
22 jurisdictions to demonstrate compliance based on program  
23 implementation. Implementation of these regulations  
24 will add importance to this rural status during the  
25 biennial review process.

1           As I've just briefly mentioned, with respect to  
2 rural jurisdictions, our research shows that small  
3 jurisdictions may have substantial -- I'm sorry -- the  
4 small jurisdiction's size may have a substantial effect  
5 on the accuracy of diversion rates.

6           We look at size in terms of disposal,  
7 population, and taxable sales. Also base year age is an  
8 important indicator. Unless a jurisdiction is frozen in  
9 time, an older base year generation amount may not be a  
10 good predictor of measurement year generation. This is  
11 especially true for jurisdictions that have experienced  
12 a high growth since the base year.

13           And as you'll see in the next two slides, many  
14 of the proposed accuracy indicators are based on growth  
15 since the base year.

16           The Board approved adjustment method uses  
17 population, employment, and inflation adjusted taxable  
18 sales growth rates to estimate how much waste generation  
19 has increased or decreased since the base year.

20           The original 1993 and 1994 adjustment method  
21 research tested accuracy by using residential and  
22 non-residential growth rates up to fourteen percent,  
23 because that's all the data they had at the time.  
24 Therefore, adjustment method accuracy has not been  
25 tested for jurisdictions with growth rates higher than

1 fourteen percent.

2           Also, if there's a significant change in the  
3 residential percentage of generation between the base  
4 year and the measurement year, there may be cause for  
5 concern.

6           We also looked at changes in jurisdiction  
7 level, population, and CPI adjusted taxable sales  
8 between the base year and the report year. Significant  
9 growth or decline in either of these factors may be a  
10 cause for concern.

11           And just a note, we don't look at jurisdiction  
12 level employment because it's not readily available for  
13 every jurisdiction.

14           Growth rate disparity is a measure of balance  
15 of jurisdiction growth. For instance, if the population  
16 has declined, the taxable sales and employment  
17 dramatically increase. The difference for growth rate  
18 disparity will be high, and the diversion rate estimate  
19 accuracy may be questionable.

20           And because jurisdictions may use county or  
21 jurisdiction level adjustment factors, a range of  
22 diversion rates may be calculated for each  
23 jurisdiction. In other words, there's a combination of  
24 different factors that can be used between jurisdiction  
25 and county level adjustment factors.

1           If the county level adjustment factors are  
2 growing at a much different rate than the jurisdiction  
3 level factors, then there may be a problem because it  
4 may not be representative of the jurisdiction's growth.

5           A large difference between the change in county  
6 versus change in jurisdiction level factors should be  
7 closely examined.

8           The last section in indicators is DRS  
9 disposal. We looked at variability in reported disposal  
10 over time. High variability may suggest that disposal  
11 is increasing dramatically over time, especially if the  
12 jurisdiction is growing rapidly as reflected in  
13 jurisdiction population and taxable sales growth.

14           High variability also may suggest that reported  
15 disposal is substantially inaccurate, especially if the  
16 jurisdiction is small.

17           High variability in disposal may be a cause for  
18 concern and it should be looked at closely.

19           And finally, we look at residential and  
20 non-residential disposal rates. These indicate how well  
21 the jurisdiction is reducing disposal. Extremely high  
22 disposal rates may indicate that disposal is not  
23 accurate, or that the base year residential percentage  
24 is not accurate, because we use that to split disposal  
25 into residential and non-residential.

1           So these two, last two indicators indicate not  
2 only disposal reduction effort, but potential error in  
3 the data.

4           I'm just going to show you a couple of examples  
5 of some graphs. This makes it a little easier to  
6 understand an indicator than looking at numbers.

7           This graph shows the jurisdiction's disposal  
8 tonnage compared to all other jurisdictions. The gray  
9 bars represent jurisdictions with less than 25,000 tons  
10 disposed in 2000, which is what we consider a small  
11 jurisdiction in terms of disposal.

12           The black dot at the very top indicates the  
13 jurisdiction that we selected for this example, and  
14 they're at about 16,000 tons in 2000.

15           Graphs like this for each indicator will be  
16 included in the new tool.

17           This is another example. This is residential  
18 growth in the residential side of the adjustment method  
19 formula. The gray bar again represents jurisdictions  
20 with growth rates greater than fourteen percent which is  
21 the tested limit of the adjustment method.

22           The black dot way over on the right indicates  
23 the jurisdiction's position in the distribution. Notice  
24 they're about 110 percent growth since their base year.

25           So again, I want to remind you that these

1 indicators are caution signals and not conclusions about  
2 diversion rate accuracy.

3 And with that, I'm going to turn it back over  
4 to Nick to conclude the presentation.

5 MR. CAVAGNARO: To go over the key issues  
6 relating to indicators in a little more detail. These  
7 indicators are not conclusive, they are caution signals  
8 that the diversion rate estimate may be inaccurate.

9 Indicators provides a standard evaluation for  
10 each jurisdiction. Jurisdictions may include other  
11 accuracy data in their annual reports to the Board.

12 The Office of Local Assistance staff currently  
13 include this information in biennial review agenda  
14 items.

15 Indicators is a quantitative supplement to the  
16 diversion rate estimate.

17 Finally, indicators is a tool that should help  
18 to balance diversion rate data with diversion program  
19 information.

20 Options for the Board include three:

21 First, implement indicators beginning with the  
22 next full biennial review cycle.

23 Second, modify indicators and return for  
24 further discussion and direction.

25 Third, modify indicators as directed, then

1 implement indicators beginning with the next full  
2 biennial review cycle.

3 Staff recommends option one, that is direct  
4 staff to implement indicators beginning with the next  
5 full biennial review cycle.

6 Are there any questions? We'd be happy to  
7 answer if there are.

8 COMMITTEE CHAIR JONES: There are. Chairman  
9 Moulton-Patterson.

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: Thank you,  
11 Chairman Jones.

12 I, it's my understanding that the development  
13 of the indicators was a recommendation of the 2202  
14 working group?

15 MR. CAVAGNARO: That's correct.

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: Have you  
17 gotten feedback from this group that this is what they  
18 had in mind?

19 MR. CAVAGNARO: We released this information to  
20 the public at the same time we released it to the Board.  
21 I'm not aware that we've received any specific comment  
22 at this time.

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: I think  
24 it, you know, it might be a good idea to at least run it  
25 by that working group.

1 MR. CAVAGNARO: We'd be happy to do that.

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: Thank you.

3 COMMITTEE CHAIR JONES: Mr. Eaton.

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER EATON: Obviously this has  
5 just been developed. How many test runs have we run  
6 against jurisdictions to test the reliability of the  
7 indicators that have been proposed here?

8 MR. HALL: I'll defer to Tim to answer that  
9 one.

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER EATON: I mean, you know, it's  
11 kind of like war games, I'm sure we've run several  
12 programs to test the reliability of the formulas and  
13 things of that nature.

14 MR. HALL: Yeah. Actually, actually a lot of  
15 the statistical analysis that we did for this we had  
16 also done as part of the adjustment method working group  
17 background information. And we reran the same tests,  
18 you see back then we had 1999 data, we reran it again  
19 using 2000 data.

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER EATON: And the other quick  
21 question is that on page 38-3 you had indicated data,  
22 and you say,

23 "Not all of the accuracy  
24 indicators proposed in this report  
25 have been developed at this time.

1           Some of the suggested indicators  
2           require data that is not readily  
3           available, is incomplete, or is  
4           inconsistent."

5           My question is, are there any of those that  
6   you're still working on that you feel would be a better  
7   tool that we as a Board need to further develop and  
8   inform, if we do adopt these indicators, to inform those  
9   who are going to have to apply them that there are  
10  others coming down the pike, and that this is not just a  
11  whole comprehensive list.

12          Because that's what has always happened with  
13  the Board is that we've come out with a certain kind of  
14  program, a certain number of factors, and they say well  
15  you never told us about anything in the future, and I  
16  just notice that that's here.

17          Are there those in your opinion that would be  
18  even more helpful but we just haven't had the time or  
19  the data to develop them?

20          MR. HALL:  Actually there are a few that we're  
21  looking at and hope that they, that they work out.

22          For instance, we want to look at how scales and  
23  survey frequency at landfills might affect disposal, the  
24  accuracy of disposal.  Right now we just don't have  
25  complete enough data regarding those facilities to see

1 if there is any relationship between high variability in  
2 disposal and the lack of scales or the lack of data  
3 surveys at a landfill.

4 COMMITTEE CHAIR JONES: Thanks, Mr. Eaton. I  
5 just wanted to ask a follow-up. The san district who  
6 had originally done their disposal reporting on a  
7 quarterly basis as required by law has changed to a  
8 daily basis.

9 Now we've got the Southern California cities  
10 that are always talking about how waste has been  
11 assigned to them that wasn't theirs. Is that going to  
12 be one of your test areas? I mean you've got eighty  
13 plus jurisdictions that feed into that system. Will  
14 that be one of your areas that you're going to review to  
15 see how that variability may either be eliminated or at  
16 least reduced?

17 MR. HALL: I'd love to be able to do that.  
18 What we really need, and we actually did this with some  
19 data from Riverside County, they, all the facilities in  
20 Riverside County do daily surveys.

21 They actually provided 1995 and 2000 data to  
22 us, daily data, which we were able to, and this was also  
23 included in the background material in the appendices in  
24 the 2202 report where we looked at how taking the  
25 quarterly survey week data and extrapolating that

1 compares to the daily data. And we actually found that  
2 the small jurisdictions, you know, the error was really  
3 high for those when we extrapolate.

4 If we could get more data like that from  
5 counties or from facilities, that would be great because  
6 we could, you know, get a better idea of how the  
7 quarterly survey data compares to daily survey. I'd  
8 leave to get the data from the san district.

9 MS. VAN KEKERIX: For L.A. County San District  
10 we're not going to be able to compare the quarterly data  
11 versus the every load every day, because what we, we can  
12 take a look at what's happening in terms of variability,  
13 but the reason that we could use the Riverside data was  
14 we have the every load every day. That was our whole  
15 sample set. And then we could take subsamples and see  
16 what happened. But with the L.A. County quarterly data,  
17 we don't have all the data points.

18 COMMITTEE CHAIR JONES: No, I understand that,  
19 but I think L.A. County San District has gone to daily.

20 MS. VAN KEKERIX: Right, they have.

21 COMMITTEE CHAIR JONES: And so in six months or  
22 sometime --

23 MS. VAN KEKERIX: We can run --

24 COMMITTEE CHAIR JONES: You should have, I mean  
25 I'm sure they'll work with you to make it available.

1 MR. HALL: Yeah, if we can get the data, the  
2 daily data from them --

3 COMMITTEE CHAIR JONES: Right.

4 MR. HALL: -- then we can.

5 COMMITTEE CHAIR JONES: Yeah, and I'm not  
6 talking about tomorrow, I'm talking about six months or  
7 whatever.

8 MS. VAN KEKERIX: Right.

9 MR. HALL: We can't do it by tomorrow.

10 COMMITTEE CHAIR JONES: But it would be a huge  
11 tool for us.

12 MS. VAN KEKERIX: Right.

13 COMMITTEE CHAIR JONES: Because of all of the  
14 issues that surrounded a lot of those jurisdictions.

15 Any other questions, Mr. Medina or Madam  
16 Chair?

17 I just have one question. When we've got the  
18 preexisting or the old original base years, and these  
19 indicators are going to help reflect hopefully better  
20 what their current state is, have you looked at, we  
21 have, we have a roomful of people that have probably  
22 either had to live with an old base year or do a new  
23 base year, we had a couple of things that have happened  
24 along the, line along the course since 1989.

25 One was the legislation of putting in

1 restricted waste where jurisdictions were counting  
2 things that had never gone to the landfill. And we do  
3 have occasion where some of that material tries to come  
4 into new base years under the restricted waste issues.

5           We had to stop the process of new base years  
6 because of creative math that inflated an awful lot of  
7 activities, we took an awful lot of heat for stopping  
8 the system for six months or however long it took us to  
9 get to the bottom of that.

10           We still have some Board approved base years  
11 that have inflated numbers, we know it, we just didn't  
12 catch it at the time.

13           Will these indicators allow you to further  
14 determine where inflated source reduction or inflated  
15 recycling via extrapolation are not reflective of the  
16 programs or the activities of a jurisdiction? Does that  
17 give you a tool that will kind of make that blow off the  
18 map?

19           MR. HALL: Unfortunately we have, we don't have  
20 a lot of data about, especially about the original base  
21 years. In other words, we don't have the sample data,  
22 we don't have a lot of the data regarding new base years  
23 in any kind of database. So these indicators that we're  
24 using now don't really tell you about accuracy of the  
25 base year --

1 COMMITTEE CHAIR JONES: Okay.

2 MR. HALL: -- whether or not they're inflated  
3 or underestimated. Unfortunately we just, we don't have  
4 the data to be able to do that.

5 The only thing we can say about the base year  
6 is that it's ten years old or that it's eleven years  
7 old, and there's been a lot of growth since the base  
8 year, and that that, that those two factors might impact  
9 the accuracy of the estimated diversion rates.

10 COMMITTEE CHAIR JONES: It's going to be  
11 interesting to see what these indicators do on some of  
12 these more recent base years because it should drive the  
13 number through the roof and be a little bit hard to  
14 validate how, I mean when you have a jurisdiction that,  
15 for the sake of argument, a customer generates a  
16 thousand tons, and because of the way that their math is  
17 they recycled 88 or 880 tons, that leaves a, basically  
18 two garbage cans picked up every month at a business  
19 that generates a thousand tons. That don't pass the  
20 smell test.

21 But it will be interesting to see what kind of  
22 tool this is.

23 MS. VAN KEKERIX: I think that as we develop  
24 more information and as the, we get more and more base  
25 years in, we can start looking at whether we can do some

1 of those kinds of things for you.

2 I see this process as developing over time the  
3 more data we get in. And we've done a lot of work up to  
4 this point, but there's still more to be done. And I  
5 think that we can refine these over the years and make  
6 them even more useful.

7 And one of the reasons we were recommending  
8 waiting for the next full cycle of biennial reviews for  
9 implementing these is to give jurisdictions a chance to  
10 get this information and see how they stack up in terms  
11 of accuracy so that they can make plans that will help  
12 improve the accuracy.

13 COMMITTEE CHAIR JONES: The request from Chair  
14 Moulton-Patterson to find out if the working group has  
15 had an opportunity to comment on this is pretty key  
16 since we've included that all the way along.

17 I think, I don't know what the pleasure of the  
18 committee would be, but I think we ought to give 'em,  
19 you know, thirty days to comment. And based on those  
20 comments, if there are no comments, if everything is  
21 okay, I mean maybe you can bring it back as a, I don't  
22 want to dismiss it and say quick discussion item, but if  
23 it comes back that there were no comments, then I think  
24 we can take an action to go ahead and direct staff to  
25 move forward, but we'll do that at the next committee

1 meeting.

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: That will  
3 be fine. I just wanted to give them an opportunity to  
4 comment and let them know that this is their time to  
5 comment.

6 COMMITTEE CHAIR JONES: Mr. Medina.

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER MEDINA: I would agree with  
8 that, I think thirty days is sufficient.

9 COMMITTEE CHAIR JONES: Okay. All right.  
10 Thank you.

11 All right, Mr. Schiavo. Item G.

12 MR. SCHIAVO: Item G is consideration of the  
13 1999-2000 biennial review findings for the source  
14 reduction and recycling element and household hazardous  
15 waste element for a number of jurisdictions.

16 And Tabettha Willmon will be making this  
17 presentation.

18 MS. WILLMON: Good morning, committee members.  
19 I want to start out by informing you that Kern County  
20 has been pulled from agenda item D. We're working on  
21 that with BAWDS and that should be showing up, I was  
22 told the revisions would be coming out later this week  
23 for that. So I believe there are also copies here for  
24 you that reflect that Kern County has been pulled.

25 Items G and H present to the committee for its

1 consideration of Board staff's biennial review findings  
2 for the 1999 and 2000 biennial review period.

3 AB 939 requires the Board to conduct a review  
4 at least once every two years of each jurisdiction's  
5 progress in meeting the mandated diversion requirements.

6 The eight jurisdictions listed in these two  
7 streamlined agenda items are the fourth group that Board  
8 staff plan to present in the streamlined format.

9 Staff have conducted their biennial review and  
10 found that these jurisdictions have achieved a 2000  
11 diversion rate of at least 50 percent and are adequately  
12 implementing source reduction, recycling, and  
13 composting, public education, and information programs  
14 as outlined in their source reduction and recycling  
15 elements.

16 Upon review, staff analysis indicates that two  
17 of the eight jurisdictions in these items show greater  
18 than five percent change from 1999 to 2000, and the  
19 details for these two jurisdictions can be found in  
20 attachment two in both of the items.

21 Most of these jurisdictions are small. And  
22 it's important to note that their diversion rates can be  
23 impacted by the slightest fluctuation in any one of the  
24 factors that most affect measurement year calculations,  
25 which are disposal, population, employment, and taxable

1 sales.

2 While taking this into consideration, as part  
3 of the biennial review, Board staff conducted site  
4 visits and verified that each jurisdiction's diversion  
5 program implementation is solid in its foundation and  
6 effectiveness, which is the basis for staff's  
7 recommendation in these two items.

8 Agenda item G lists those jurisdictions for  
9 which staff is recommending approval of the 1999-2000  
10 biennial review.

11 Should the Board not accept staff's  
12 recommendations, these jurisdictions have reserved the  
13 right in their 2000 annual report to submit SB 1066 time  
14 extension requests.

15 And that concludes my presentation for item G.

16 COMMITTEE CHAIR JONES: Any questions? And we  
17 need a motion.

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER MEDINA: I'd like to move this  
19 item. If there are no questions I'd like to move  
20 Resolution 2002-233, consideration of the '99-2000  
21 biennial review findings for the source reduction and  
22 recycling element and household hazardous waste element  
23 for the following jurisdictions: Alameda County, Union  
24 City; Kern County; Riverside County, Hemet; Santa Clara  
25 County, Santa Clara County Unincorporated.

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER EATON: Second.

2 COMMITTEE CHAIR JONES: Okay. We have a  
3 motion -- oh, Kern is out, we'll delete Kern. Delete  
4 Kern.

5 Thank you, Mr. Medina. And Mr. Eaton seconded.

6 Could you call the roll?

7 COMMITTEE SECRETARY BAKULICH: Eaton?

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER EATON: Aye.

9 COMMITTEE SECRETARY BAKULICH: Medina?

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER MEDINA: Aye.

11 COMMITTEE SECRETARY BAKULICH: Jones?

12 COMMITTEE CHAIR JONES: Aye.

13 Leave the roll open for Linda Moulton-Patterson  
14 when she gets back on this item.

15 Item number forty which is, we've got to wait  
16 until Linda gets back.

17 Go ahead and continue.

18 MR. SCHIAVO: Okay. This is also consideration  
19 of the 1999-2000 biennial review findings for the source  
20 reduction and recycling element and household hazardous  
21 waste element for a number of jurisdictions.

22 And Tabetha will also be making this  
23 presentation.

24 MS. WILLMON: Agenda item H lists those  
25 jurisdictions for which staff is also recommending

1 approval of the 1999 and 2000 biennial review. However,  
2 should the Board not accept staff's recommendations,  
3 these jurisdictions did not elect to reserve the right  
4 in their 2000 annual report to submit an SB 1066  
5 extension request which gives the Board an alternative  
6 set of options as outlined in the agenda item.

7 This concludes my presentation for item H.

8 COMMITTEE CHAIR JONES: Okay. Any questions?

9 Mr. Medina.

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER MEDINA: If there are no  
11 questions, I'd like to move Resolution 2002-234,  
12 consideration of the '99-2000 biennial review findings  
13 for the source reduction and recycling element and  
14 household hazardous waste element for the following  
15 jurisdictions:

16 Humboldt County, Trinidad; San Joaquin County,  
17 Lathrop; Shasta County, Shasta County Waste Management  
18 Agency; Solano County, Vacaville; Tulare County, and  
19 Consolidated Waste Management Authority.

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER EATON: Second.

21 COMMITTEE CHAIR JONES: We have a motion and a  
22 second.

23 Would you call the roll?

24 COMMITTEE SECRETARY BAKULICH: Eaton?

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER EATON: Aye.

1 COMMITTEE SECRETARY BAKULICH: Medina?

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER MEDINA: Aye.

3 COMMITTEE SECRETARY BAKULICH: Jones?

4 COMMITTEE CHAIR JONES: Aye. And we'll leave  
5 it open for Linda Moulton-Patterson.

6 These are, when Linda gets back if she votes on  
7 both of these and doesn't have a problem, I'm going to  
8 suggest these for content, Mr. Eaton. Okay. So we'll  
9 wait until she gets back.

10 Mr. Schiavo, item I.

11 MR. SCHIAVO: Item I or item number 41 in the  
12 Board packet is consideration of adequacy of the five  
13 year review report for the county-wide integrated waste  
14 management plan for the County of Yolo.

15 And Carolyn Sullivan will be making this  
16 presentation.

17 MS. SULLIVAN: Good morning, Chairman Jones and  
18 committee members.

19 I'd like to alert you to the fact that earlier  
20 this morning a revised version of the attachment one for  
21 this agenda item was distributed.

22 Each county is required to review and, if  
23 necessary, revise its county-wide integrated waste  
24 management plan every five years. A review report with  
25 findings is then due to the Board.

1           The Board staff had ninety days to review this  
2 report and bring it before the Board for approval or  
3 disapproval. The report was delivered to the Board on  
4 February 6th, 2002, therefore the ninety day date is May  
5 6th, 2002.

6           After review of the initial report, Board staff  
7 requested additional information be provided in the  
8 county's report, and asked for it to be delivered within  
9 thirty days or by April 4th, 2002.

10           The additional information was delivered on  
11 March 22nd, and the county has been made aware that this  
12 item will be voted on at the Board's May meeting which  
13 falls slightly over the ninety day date.

14           The Yolo County local task force completed its  
15 review of the CWIWMP, and in concurrence with the county  
16 the determination was made that a revision of the  
17 county's plan was not necessary at this time.

18           The county's review report and Board staff's  
19 analysis are included as attachments to this item.

20           Board staff has evaluated the county's review  
21 report and determined that the required elements have  
22 been addressed.

23           Therefore, it is staff's recommendation that  
24 the Board approve the county's assessment that no  
25 revision is necessary for Yolo's county-wide integrated

1 waste management plan.

2 This concludes my presentation. Are there any  
3 questions for Board staff or county staff at this time?

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER EATON: Just what were the  
5 changes, were they grammatical? Because I haven't had a  
6 chance to read this. What were the changes?

7 MS. SULLIVAN: Actually there was a scanning  
8 error and only the odd pages weren't included in it.

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER EATON: So there was no  
10 substantive --

11 MS. SULLIVAN: There was no changes to the  
12 report that was submitted.

13 COMMITTEE CHAIR JONES: Okay. Do I hear a  
14 motion?

15 Mr. Medina.

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER MEDINA: Chair Jones, I'd like  
17 to move Resolution 2002-235, consideration of the  
18 adequacy of the five year review report of the  
19 county-wide integrated waste management plan for the  
20 County of Yolo.

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: I'll  
22 second.

23 COMMITTEE CHAIR JONES: All right. I have, we  
24 have a motion from Mr. Medina and a second from Chair  
25 Linda Moulton-Patterson.

1 Go ahead and call the roll.

2 COMMITTEE SECRETARY BAKULICH: Eaton?

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER EATON: Aye.

4 COMMITTEE SECRETARY BAKULICH: Medina?

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER MEDINA: Aye.

6 COMMITTEE SECRETARY BAKULICH: Moulton-

7 Patterson?

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER ROBERTI: Aye.

9 COMMITTEE SECRETARY BAKULICH: Jones?

10 COMMITTEE CHAIR JONES: Aye. I'd like to go  
11 ahead and put that on consent.

12 Madam Chair, we had two items, item 39, Kern  
13 County, and we left the roll open.

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: Yes, for  
15 that.

16 COMMITTEE CHAIR JONES: Are you okay with  
17 putting that on consent?

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: Yes, I am.

19 COMMITTEE CHAIR JONES: And item forty, is  
20 that --

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: Is that H?

22 COMMITTEE CHAIR JONES: That's H.

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: And also  
24 is that recommended for consent?

25 COMMITTEE CHAIR JONES: Yes.

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: That's  
2 fine.

3 COMMITTEE CHAIR JONES: Those are both four  
4 0's, and both will go on consent. All right.

5 Moving right along. We are on item J, 40 in  
6 the program.

7 MR. SCHIAVO: Item J or item 42 in the Board  
8 packet is consideration of the application for an SB  
9 1066 alternative diversion requirement for the City of  
10 Lincoln, Placer County.

11 And Kyle Pogue will be making this  
12 presentation.

13 MR. POGUE: Good morning, I'm Kyle Pogue with  
14 the Office of Local Assistance.

15 The city of Lincoln in Placer County submitted  
16 an SB 1066 document requesting an alternative diversion  
17 requirement until September 31st, 2003.

18 Lincoln built its request on its 2000 diversion  
19 rate of 11 percent. The city is requesting an ADR  
20 instead of the time extension, because disposal and  
21 diversion measurement challenges prevent the city from  
22 submitting a plan of correction that could meet or  
23 exceed the 50 percent diversion goal.

24 Both city and Board staff agree that  
25 enhancement and program implementation is necessary, and

1 this is reflected in the application.

2 That said, the city is also including  
3 supporting programs that should yield better diversion  
4 and disposal measurement.

5 The city is confident that the combination of  
6 significant diversion program development and  
7 substantial improvement of diversion measurement will  
8 result in achievement of AB 939 goals.

9 Specific reasons why this agency needs an  
10 alternative diversion requirement are as follows.

11 Number one. Several operational barriers at  
12 the Western Regional Materials Recovery Facility  
13 contributed to Lincoln needing additional time to  
14 achieve the 50 percent goal.

15 This includes the fact that the MRF became  
16 operational later than planned, and that the facility is  
17 yet to attain its projected diversion goals.

18 Number two. Due to flow control considerations  
19 and MRF compatibility issues, the city could not  
20 implement source separated diversion programs without  
21 first gaining the approval of the Western Placer Waste  
22 Management Authority.

23 Number three. The pursuit of accurate  
24 diversion rates is taking significant time and resources  
25 away from program implementation.

1           And then finally, the agency needs the amount  
2 of time requested to achieve full implementation of the  
3 programs in the goal achievement section of the SB 1066  
4 application.

5           The programs listed in the goal achievement  
6 are:

7           Number one, a residential curbside green waste  
8 program. The city plans to expand their fall leaf  
9 collection program by offering containerized curbside  
10 service to 2,000 households in the initial phase, and  
11 5,000 households upon completion.

12          Number two, a residential curbside recycling  
13 program. The city plans to increase the materials  
14 collected and to expand promotion of the current  
15 program.

16          Number three, special event recycling. The  
17 city will expand beverage container recycling at all  
18 special events and large venues.

19          Number four, implementation of a construction  
20 and demolition ordinance requiring licensed haulers to  
21 submit quarterly reports identifying the type and  
22 quantity of waste handled. Source separation of  
23 materials will be strongly encouraged.

24          School recycling programs, number five.  
25 Cardboard and office paper recycling will be available

1 to all schools in the city.

2           Number six, implementation of two contract  
3 enhancements with the Western Regional Materials  
4 Recovery Facility to increase the guaranteed minimum  
5 recovery rates.

6           Number seven, the residential drive program.  
7 The city will provide five 30-yard bins for drive of  
8 newspaper, glass, and plastic at various locations.

9           Number eight, commercial on-site pickup. The  
10 pit I will offer office paper and cardboard recycling to  
11 commercial businesses in the downtown area and to  
12 government offices.

13           Number nine. The city will adopt a Buy  
14 Recycled procurement policy, and implement a source  
15 reduction policy.

16           And finally, number ten. The city will expand  
17 outreach programs to promote the new diversion programs  
18 slated for implementation.

19           Board staff have determined that the  
20 information submitted within the application is  
21 adequately documented.

22           Based on this information, Board staff is  
23 recommending that the Board approve the time extension  
24 request for the city.

25           Several representatives are available from the

1 city and are present to answer any questions you may  
2 have. In addition, I can answer any questions too.

3 And that concludes my presentation. Any  
4 questions from the members?

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER MEDINA: Yeah, on page 42-4,  
6 the reference to Rio Bravo that you have in here.

7 MR. POGUE: Do you want me to explain that a  
8 little bit more?

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER MEDINA: Yes.

10 MR. POGUE: Lincoln was able to claim for 2000  
11 credit for biomass and diversion credit through sending  
12 material to the Rio Bravo facility in Lincoln for  
13 biomass.

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER MEDINA: So the Rio Bravo  
15 facility is located in Lincoln?

16 MR. POGUE: It is located in Lincoln and  
17 actually provides service to a number of jurisdictions  
18 throughout Placer County and beyond.

19 COMMITTEE CHAIR JONES: Okay. I have a couple  
20 of questions for either Becky Siren or whoever she's  
21 working for.

22 The C&D ordinance that you're talking about  
23 that's going to capture the material that the haulers  
24 are hauling, which is a problem in Lincoln and other  
25 places because most of that stuff probably ends up going

1 down to the landfills in Sacramento County and getting  
2 sent back. What about all the new construction that's  
3 being done in Lincoln? Is the city council looking at  
4 an ordinance on what they're generating? Because  
5 they're actually the ones that are generating the waste.

6 And is there anything about either doing some  
7 source separation through an ordinance there as opposed  
8 to just dumping it all in a dumpster and hauling it down  
9 to L&K or somebody down here?

10 MS. SIREN: The city is looking at it. At one  
11 point in time we talked about actually mandating source  
12 separation of all construction demolition waste in the  
13 city because there is a lot of construction activity  
14 going on. And at the last minute we had to change the  
15 wording in the plan because of the flood control  
16 agreement that the city of Lincoln signed with the  
17 Western Regional Landfill Authority which has to approve  
18 any source separation program.

19 So that program is still on the table, but the  
20 city manager has to work with the landfill authority  
21 before they can actually mandate that the contractors,  
22 developers source separate the contract -- the  
23 construction waste.

24 Although what we're going to do in the interim  
25 until they can get such approval is there's financial

1 incentives in place to bring clean wood waste to the  
2 MRF.

3 There's a reduced tipping fee.

4 There's also Sierra Pacific in Lincoln that  
5 also will accept clean wood waste for biomass.

6 There's also a pallet manufacturer right out by  
7 the MRF that accepts clean wood waste and they actually  
8 pay for this wood waste.

9 So we're going to advise all the developers and  
10 contractors when they pick up building permits of these  
11 financial incentives, and at the same time work with the  
12 landfill authority to develop some mandated source  
13 separation programs.

14 COMMITTEE CHAIR JONES: Yeah, cause the  
15 material that's being generated isn't ending up in the  
16 Western Regional MRF anyway, isn't most of it going down  
17 to Sacramento?

18 MS. SIREN: Well that's an issue that we're,  
19 that we're -- at this point in time all the development  
20 agreements state that they must take the material to the  
21 MRF, although every year we see reports coming back from  
22 Sac County and that's been an issue and a measurement  
23 accuracy problem for us because we've not been able to  
24 actually verify the accuracy of the data we're receiving  
25 from Sacramento County. And at the same time we didn't

1 have an ordinance in place at Lincoln that required the  
2 private haulers to report what kind of waste they were  
3 collecting and where they were disposing of that waste.

4 So we're hoping this new ordinance will get a  
5 new handle on the construction waste, that we can  
6 actually verify that the waste is going to the MRF, and  
7 also then tap that construction waste for some source  
8 separation and diversion of the clean wood waste and  
9 other materials.

10 COMMITTEE CHAIR JONES: All right. Any  
11 questions?

12 Thank you, Becky. Appreciate it. All right.

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER MEDINA: Chair Jones, I'd like  
14 to move Resolution 2002-236, consideration of the  
15 application for Senate Bill 1066 alternative diversion  
16 requirement for the city of Lincoln, Placer County.

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: I'll  
18 second that.

19 COMMITTEE CHAIR JONES: We have a motion by Mr.  
20 Medina and a second by Linda Moulton-Patterson.

21 Is it okay if we substitute the previous roll?  
22 All right, so moved.

23 And we're going to put this on consent? So  
24 moved.

25 All right. Item 43 or K.

1           MR. SCHIAVO: This is consideration of the  
2 application for an SB 1066 time extension for the city  
3 of Rocklin in Placer County.

4           And Kyle will also be making this presentation.

5           MR. POGUE: Once again, Kyle Pogue, Office of  
6 Local Assistance.

7           The city of Rocklin in Placer County submitted  
8 an SB 1066 document requesting a time extension until  
9 December 31st, 2003. The city built its request on its  
10 existing 2000 diversion rate of 39 percent, and they are  
11 confident that the programs outlined in its plan of  
12 correction will successfully allow them to meet or  
13 exceed the 50 percent diversion goal.

14           The specific reasons why this city needs a time  
15 extension are as follows:

16           Number one. Several operational barriers at  
17 the Western Regional MRF contributed to Rocklin needing  
18 additional time to achieve the 50 percent goal.

19           This includes the fact that the MRF became  
20 operational later than planned, and that the facility  
21 has yet to attain its projected diversion goals.

22           Additionally, the expense in constructing the  
23 MRF forced Rocklin to stall implementation of additional  
24 diversion programs.

25           Number two. The Western Placer Waste

1 Management Authority had to approve the implementation  
2 of the curbside green waste program.

3 Number three, and finally, the city needs the  
4 amount of time requested to achieve full implementation  
5 of programs in the plan of correction.

6 Those programs are:

7 Number one. The residential curbside green  
8 waste program provided on a weekly basis that will be  
9 available to all 12,000 residences in the city.

10 In conjunction with the program, the Rocklin  
11 City Council has decided not to issue burn permits  
12 within the city.

13 Number two. Implementation of two contract  
14 enhancements with the Western Regional Materials  
15 Recovery Facility to increase the guaranteed minimum  
16 recovery rates.

17 Number three. Implementation of expanded  
18 outreach programs to support both the residential  
19 curbside green waste and commercial green waste  
20 programs.

21 Number four, implementation of a Buy Recycled  
22 procurement policy.

23 Board staff has determined that the information  
24 submitted within the application is adequately  
25 documented.

1           Based on this information, Board staff is  
2 recommending that the Board approve the time extension  
3 request for the city of Rocklin.

4           Debbie Plant from the city is present to answer  
5 any questions, and I'm also available.

6           This concludes my presentation.

7           COMMITTEE CHAIR JONES: Any questions from the  
8 members?

9           Mr. Medina.

10          COMMITTEE MEMBER MEDINA: Chair Jones, I'd like  
11 to move Resolution 2002-237, consideration of the  
12 application for an SB 1066 time extension for the city  
13 of Rocklin in Placer County.

14          COMMITTEE MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: Second.

15          COMMITTEE CHAIR JONES: We have a motion by Mr.  
16 Medina and a second by Linda Moulton-Patterson.

17          Substitute the previous roll.

18          All right. Put it on consent?

19          So done.

20          COMMITTEE MEMBER EATON: Can I ask a question  
21 of staff? What does it mean? When these come before us  
22 and could we have a, and maybe we'll talk about a  
23 schematic, they had no, previously Rocklin had no green  
24 procurement policy, Lincoln was developing it. I mean  
25 there's like semantics in here, so do they just tell us

1 that they're going to do it and we don't have a report  
2 that tells us whether or not they did do it?

3 MR. SCHIAVO: Yeah, in this case -- do you want  
4 to answer?

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER EATON: I'm sorry, I'm just  
6 trying generally, I'm not trying to get jurisdiction  
7 specific, but there's like different kinds of, some have  
8 it in place and some are just saying that well, they're  
9 thinking about developing it.

10 MR. SCHIAVO: The way we can find out if  
11 they've done it or not is by our site verifications as  
12 well as the annual report submittals.

13 So when they tell us in 1999 that they're going  
14 to be doing it, the next year we have the opportunity to  
15 find out if they've actually done it by a site visit, we  
16 can go out and specifically look at that program, and  
17 also it should be annotated in their annual report the  
18 status of what they've done with it. And that's  
19 typically what we do.

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER EATON: And wouldn't that be  
21 part of the reporting if we included that as a  
22 requirement of the 1066?

23 MR. SCHIAVO: Yes, and it would be part of the  
24 reporting process.

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER EATON: We haven't done that

1 with jurisdictions, right?

2 MR. SCHIAVO: We are putting that in the  
3 resolution for each one of these that they need to  
4 submit a report to us regarding the status of their  
5 implementation as well as report to the Board at the end  
6 of the 1066 application process.

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER EATON: So in other words, we  
8 wouldn't find out from jurisdictions until eighteen  
9 months from now?

10 MR. SCHIAVO: Well, we find out twelve months  
11 from now unless we want to do it more frequently. But  
12 staff typically will make phone --

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER EATON: You said eighteen, I  
14 mean it ends in 2003?

15 MR. SCHIAVO: We would get the first report --  
16 we ask for annual reports.

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER EATON: Right.

18 MR. SCHIAVO: The first report would be, I  
19 believe, August.

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER EATON: By the time we would  
21 review it?

22 MR. SCHIAVO: Yeah, no, there's -- no, the lag  
23 time.

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER EATON: I'm getting there,  
25 aren't I?

1 MR. SCHIAVO: Yeah.

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER EATON: There's a little time  
3 delay there, but I just wanted to make sure. So but in  
4 essence we wouldn't hear. And that's not a criticism,  
5 that's just what the reality is.

6 MR. SCHIAVO: Right.

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER EATON: Okay.

8 COMMITTEE CHAIR JONES: One year, but they're  
9 going to get it.

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER EATON: Well we get it but we  
11 don't review it, so we won't know until they come up  
12 again.

13 MR. SCHIAVO: Unless we make a site visit  
14 before that time we would find out, but typically --

15 COMMITTEE CHAIR JONES: Thank you.

16 MR. SCHIAVO: On this particular cycle right  
17 now -- I just wanted to clarify.

18 COMMITTEE CHAIR JONES: Sure.

19 MR. SCHIAVO: They would address it in the  
20 annual report submitted to us this year. And right now  
21 we're in, you know, the month of May, so we would find  
22 out the status a little bit sooner.

23 But for the ones we start hearing in August or  
24 September or October, then it would be twelve months,  
25 eleven months, ten months, depending on the cycle of the

1 annual report, so it varied a little bit.

2 COMMITTEE CHAIR JONES: All right. Thank you.

3 Item L, number 44.

4 MR. SCHIAVO: Item L is consideration of the  
5 application for an SB 1066 time extension for the city  
6 of Auburn in Placer County.

7 And again this will be Kyle.

8 MR. POGUE: Okay. This is the last one for me.

9 The city of Auburn in Placer County submitted  
10 an SB 1066 document requesting a time extension until  
11 December 31st, 2003. Auburn's request is built on their  
12 2000 diversion rate of 38 percent, and they're confident  
13 that the programs outlined in their plan of correction  
14 will allow them to successfully meet or exceed the 50  
15 percent diversion goal.

16 The specific reasons why the city need a time  
17 extension are as follows:

18 Number one. Several operational barriers at  
19 the Western Regional MRF contributed to Auburn needing  
20 additional time to achieve the 50 percent goal.

21 This includes the fact that the MRF became  
22 operational later than planned, and that the facility  
23 has yet to attain its projected diversion goals.

24 Additionally, the expense in constructing the  
25 MRF caused the city to stall its implementation of

1 additional diversion programs.

2           Number two. The Western Placer Waste  
3 Management Authority will have to approve the  
4 implementation of the curbside green waste program.

5           Number three. The pursuit of accurate  
6 diversion rates has taken significant time and resources  
7 away from program implementation.

8           And finally, the city needs the amount of time  
9 requested to achieve full implementation of the programs  
10 and plan of correction.

11           These programs are as follows:

12           Number one, a residential curbside green waste  
13 program. The city is still considering the method of  
14 collection for this program and is deciding between the  
15 bag collection program or a fully containerized green  
16 waste program.

17           As a note, staff has concerns regarding the  
18 implementation of a green waste bag program in  
19 conjunction with a mixed waste processing facility. But  
20 the city plans to monitor and evaluate this program for  
21 effectiveness.

22           Number two, expansion of the number of  
23 residential drop-off locations for recyclables.

24           Number three. Increase use of the curbside  
25 blue bag program for the collection of recyclables for

1 increased promotion to residents.

2           Number four, implementation of a construction  
3 and demolition ordinance that will increase the use of  
4 existing C&D diversion opportunities.

5           Number five, implementation of supporting  
6 outreach programs to support these new and enhanced  
7 diversion programs.

8           And finally, implementation of a survey  
9 methodology that will allow the city to gather more  
10 accurate disposal and diversion data to determine  
11 diversion rates.

12           Board staff has determined that the information  
13 submitted within the application is adequately  
14 documented.

15           Based on this information, Board staff is  
16 recommending that the Board approve the time extension  
17 request for the city.

18           Representatives from the city, Joanna Falanger  
19 specifically, is available to answer any questions and  
20 I'm available as well.

21           That concludes my presentation. Thanks.

22           COMMITTEE CHAIR JONES: I have a question I.  
23 Don't live in Auburn but I have an Auburn address, so I  
24 live in the county.

25           The indecision about a green waste bag program

1 versus a container program, did they tell you what their  
2 success rate program was on the blue bag for recycling?  
3 I mean did they, that's been a pretty controversial or  
4 well discussed issue in that area.

5 MR. POGUE: Well, the latest figures that I've  
6 seen for the city of Auburn is that they have the  
7 highest participation rate in the blue bag program, and  
8 that was neighboring around twelve percent participation  
9 rate, so it's relatively low.

10 In regards to if they've looked at that in  
11 conjunction with the green waste program, maybe the city  
12 can better answer that question.

13 COMMITTEE CHAIR JONES: Because the extension  
14 is going to be, to help them get to the 50 percent, but  
15 it seems to me that if a lot of that time is going to be  
16 used to determine whether or not a green waste  
17 collection system or just a bag system is going to be  
18 the option, I mean we ought to know what kind of  
19 timelines.

20 Maybe somebody from the city could speak to  
21 what the thinking is on that?

22 MR. FAUSSEN: I'm Tom Faussen, City of Auburn  
23 Public Works Director.

24 COMMITTEE CHAIR JONES: Good morning.

25 MR. FAUSSEN: Chairman Jones and members of the

1 Board. We're looking within the next year to make that  
2 determination, hopefully sooner with our franchise  
3 hauler to do that. We'll make that decision relatively  
4 quickly in trying to implement the program well before  
5 the end of our three years.

6 We see that as a major benefit. We're already  
7 doing green waste separation just from our own city  
8 activities for tree trimming and that type of thing, and  
9 that's been very successful. And we may do it as a  
10 drop-off too.

11 We're trying to evaluate the best way to get  
12 the participation from the residents of the city. We  
13 have a very vocal citizenry that wants programs to  
14 participate in. I think our blue bag program is  
15 indicative of that because we have the highest  
16 participation in the county in that program.

17 So we're, within the next year I'd say we will  
18 have a determination of what way we're going to go in  
19 implementing it.

20 COMMITTEE CHAIR JONES: Because I would hate to  
21 have us approve this without, and then at the end of the  
22 three year period say, well, it's been two and a half  
23 years and this didn't work so now we're going to go to  
24 this, because that just gets, you know, that's one of  
25 the things we grapple with all the time on these

1 extensions.

2 MR. FAUSSEN: And I understand that. And we're  
3 not here to extend it out any longer than possible, we'd  
4 like to have it implemented as soon as we possibly can.

5 There's other areas that we are looking at also  
6 to try and create that. We have a major publishing  
7 company in town, the Auburn Journal, that prints almost  
8 every paper in the area, and they have quite a bit of  
9 tonnage of recycling that we don't right now believe is  
10 being counted. And so we want to work with them to try  
11 and get those numbers in there too to help us bring our  
12 percentages up.

13 COMMITTEE CHAIR JONES: Very good. Mr. Eaton?

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER EATON: Just a question for  
15 staff. Are we doing retroactive as well so it goes for  
16 2002, 2003? I'm not counting three years, and I don't  
17 want to mislead any gentleman or representative here,  
18 it's not three years, it's eighteen months which, that  
19 your extension goes to.

20 MR. SCHIAVO: Right.

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER EATON: So help me out here,  
22 what am I missing? I hear a lot of three years, but I  
23 see -- is it a typo?

24 MR. SCHIAVO: No, it's, December, 2003, is the  
25 termination date of the SB 1066 application.

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER EATON: So it's 19 months.

2 MR. SCHIAVO: Yeah, it's about 19 months.

3 Yeah.

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER EATON: Okay. All right.

5 COMMITTEE CHAIR JONES: Thank you.

6 MR. FAUSSEN: Thank you.

7 COMMITTEE CHAIR JONES: Madam Chair.

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: I'd just  
9 like to move Resolution 2002-238.

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER MEDINA: Second.

11 COMMITTEE CHAIR JONES: All right. We have a  
12 motion by Linda Moulton-Patterson, second by Mr.  
13 Medina.

14 Substitute the previous roll?

15 Okay. Put it on consent?

16 Thank you.

17 Item number 45.

18 MR. SCHIAVO: This is consideration of the  
19 application for an SB 1066 time extension for the city  
20 of Redding in Shasta County.

21 It will be presented by Jill Simmons.

22 MS. SIMMONS: Good morning, Chairman Jones and  
23 committee members, I'm Jill Simmons.

24 COMMITTEE CHAIR JONES: I don't think that's  
25 on.

1 MS. SIMMONS: Good morning, committee members,  
2 Chairman Jones. I am Jill Simmons with the Office of  
3 Local Assistance.

4 This agenda item is presenting the city of  
5 Redding's request for an SB 1066 time extension until  
6 December 31st, 2003.

7 The city built its request on its existing 2000  
8 diversion rate of 36 percent, and they are confident  
9 that the programs outlined in the plan of correction  
10 will successfully allow them to meet or exceed the 50  
11 percent diversion goal.

12 The specific reasons why this city needs the  
13 time extension are as follows:

14 The city has developed an impressive array of  
15 diversion programs. Unfortunately, they have not yet  
16 been able to reach a 50 percent diversion rate.

17 Program expansion and implementation will be  
18 completed by the end of 2002, and then the city will  
19 need an additional year to capture the increased  
20 diversion from its programs.

21 Implemented programs listed in the plan of  
22 correction are as follows:

23 In 2001 the city automated its green waste  
24 collection program. And in the first year alone the  
25 city saw a 92 percent increase in green waste diversion.

1           The city recently expanded and automated its  
2 residential curbside recycling collection program. This  
3 included providing wheeled carts to residents, and  
4 expanding the material types collected.

5           The city also started an electronic recycling  
6 program to divert televisions, computer equipment, and  
7 other electronic office equipment.

8           Programs to be implemented in the plan of  
9 correction are as follows:

10          The city is currently in the process of  
11 purchasing new automated collection trucks. These  
12 special trucks will allow the city to collect from about  
13 1,100 residents who are unable to participate in  
14 curbside and green waste recycling due to their  
15 location.

16          Beginning in late spring, the city will target  
17 700 multi-family and small commercial accounts for mixed  
18 recyclable collection. Each subsequent year the city  
19 plans to target an additional 25 percent of these  
20 commercial and multi-family customers, until the service  
21 has been offered to everyone.

22          Beginning in May of 2002, the city will also be  
23 expanding their office paper program.

24          Board staff has determined that the information  
25 submitted within the application is adequately

1 documented.

2 Based on this information, Board staff is  
3 recommending that the Board approve the time extension  
4 request for the city.

5 A Representative from the city and Board staff  
6 are present to answer any questions.

7 This concludes my presentation. Thank you.

8 COMMITTEE CHAIR JONES: Mr. Eaton.

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER EATON: I just have a  
10 question, maybe for the city. My understanding is that  
11 the bridge has been cleared and is about to be completed  
12 for -- Turtle Bridge, is it, or Turtle Bay? The big,  
13 you know, huge project?

14 MR. MORALES: Good morning, Larry Morales for  
15 the city of Redding. The Turtle Bay bridge, yes, it's a  
16 pedestrian bridge. It's a couple years behind, but it's  
17 being completed as we speak.

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER EATON: Okay. And the reason  
19 why I'm asking is because I see no correlation here  
20 because it's supposed to be a main attraction, a renewal  
21 of the waterfront. And I think it was what, \$25 million  
22 or something?

23 MR. MORALES: 22 million.

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER EATON: The longest bridge in  
25 the world for pedestrians. And it's a great, great, you

1 know, I think feature. I'm concerned that is that going  
2 to bring in tourists? And there's nothing in the plan  
3 of correction that addresses that, you know.

4 And at some point I just want to make sure that  
5 we have that met. I mean you are expecting --

6 MR. MORALES: We will expect some tourists,  
7 yes.

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER EATON: Right.

9 COMMITTEE CHAIR JONES: We already have a  
10 significant amount of tourist population, transient  
11 population there of tourists.

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER EATON: Do you see a waste  
13 stream that is going to, you know, really impact greatly  
14 or, so that you can reach the goal? I'm trying to add  
15 more but I want to make sure of that. There's an  
16 element there that needs to be looked at, and cause we  
17 have that in other places throughout the state, wherever  
18 there's been a major tourist attraction there's been an  
19 increase in flow. And so maybe that's something that we  
20 need to look at currently. And I don't see anything in  
21 here.

22 MR. MORALES: This is a city facility and there  
23 are some recycling programs already in place there, and  
24 we can expand those as we get more tourists.

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER EATON: I just -- but you

1 think that with the new event, the new attraction that  
2 your current program is going to be able to handle the  
3 influx, bottom line?

4 MR. MORALES: We believe so, yes.

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER EATON: Thank you.

6 COMMITTEE CHAIR JONES: Thank you. Mr. Medina.

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER MEDINA: Chair Jones, I'd like  
8 to move approval of 1066 time extension by the city of  
9 Redding, Shasta County.

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: I'll  
11 second that.

12 COMMITTEE CHAIR JONES: I have a motion by Mr.  
13 Medina and a second by Linda Moulton-Patterson.

14 Substitute the previous roll and put it on  
15 consent for the next meeting?

16 So ordered. Thank you.

17 Item 46 or N.

18 MR. SCHIAVO: This is consideration of the  
19 application for an SB 1066 time extension by the  
20 unincorporated area of Tulare County.

21 And Rebecca Brown will be making this  
22 presentation.

23 MS. BROWN: Good morning, Chairman Jones and  
24 members of the committee. I'm Rebecca Brown with the  
25 Office of Local Assistance.

1           The unincorporated Tulare County has submitted  
2   an SB 1066 document requesting a time extension through  
3   December 31st, 2003.

4           The county built its request on its 2000  
5   diversion rate of 42 percent.

6           The county is confident that the programs  
7   outlined in its plan of correction will successfully  
8   allow them to meet or exceed the 50 percent diversion  
9   goal.

10          The specific reasons the county needs the time  
11   extension are:

12          To fully implement the new programs and track  
13   program effectiveness, especially implementing and  
14   tracking the enforcement of their hauler program.

15          County staff will recommend to the Board of  
16   Supervisors that the haulers be put on compliance  
17   schedules, include a consideration of revocation of  
18   licenses to collect solid waste in the county from any  
19   collector who is unable or unwilling to meet the  
20   diversion within the three year time extension.

21          The time extension is also needed to take the  
22   steps necessary to become a member of the Consolidated  
23   Waste Management Authority regional agency whose  
24   regional programs will benefit the county.

25          Most of the implementation activities will take

1 place in 2003. The programs listed in the plan of  
2 correction are: Expanded enforcement of hauler  
3 requirements, expanded landfill salvage, transformation,  
4 Outreach, waste assessments, and regional agency  
5 membership.

6 Board staff has determined that the information  
7 submitted within the application is adequately  
8 documented.

9 Based on this information, Board staff is  
10 recommending that the Board approve the time extension  
11 request for the county.

12 A representative from the county is present to  
13 answer any questions.

14 This concludes my presentation.

15 COMMITTEE CHAIR JONES: Any questions from  
16 members?

17 Can we have a motion?

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER MEDINA: Chairman Jones, I'd  
19 like to move approval of the 1066 time extension by the  
20 unincorporated area --

21 COMMITTEE CHAIR JONES: Okay. And I'll second.

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER MEDINA: -- of Tulare County.

23 COMMITTEE CHAIR JONES: We have a motion to  
24 adopt Resolution 2002-240 by Mr. Medina and seconded by  
25 Jones.

1           Substitute the previous roll? Put it on  
2 consent?

3           So ordered. Thank you.

4           Item number 47, O.

5           MR. SCHIAVO: Consideration of the application  
6 for an SB 1066 time extension by the city of Exeter,  
7 Tulare County.

8           And Rebecca will be making this presentation.

9           MS. BROWN: Rebecca Brown, Office of Local  
10 Assistance.

11           The city of Exeter submitted a 1066 document  
12 requesting a time extension through December 31st, 2003.

13           The city built its request on its 2000  
14 diversion rate of 25 percent. The city's diversion rate  
15 has resulted in part because the city council believed  
16 it needed to delay raising rates required for the  
17 expansion of the recycling program until it had  
18 completed their waste water treatment plant expansion.

19           Because the city was raising utility rates in  
20 1999, 2000, 2001, and 2002 for that plant expansion, and  
21 because of the recent fears from permanently increased  
22 utility rates for electricity, the city delayed raising  
23 rates for the recycling programs.

24           With the plant expansion over, it's now  
25 possible to expand the recycling program and increase

1 rates.

2           The city is confident that the programs  
3 outlined in its plan of correction will successfully  
4 allow them to meet or exceed the 50 percent diversion  
5 goal.

6           The specific reasons the city needs a time  
7 extension are:

8           To provide the city with the opportunity to  
9 roll out the new programs, including a curbside  
10 recycling program.

11           To develop a strategy for the additional  
12 utility rate increases.

13           And to take the steps needed to become a member  
14 of the Consolidated Waste Management Authority regional  
15 agency whose regional programs will benefit the city.

16           Most of the implementation activities will take  
17 place in 2002 and 2003. The programs listed in the plan  
18 of correction are: Curbside recycling, commingled  
19 commercial collection, commercial green waste drop-off,  
20 school outreach, print outreach, curbside recycling  
21 promotion, and regional agency membership.

22           Board staff has determined that the information  
23 submitted within the application is adequately  
24 documented.

25           And based on this information, Board staff is

1 recommending that the Board approve the time extension  
2 request to the city.

3 A representative from the city is present to  
4 answer any questions.

5 This concludes my presentation.

6 COMMITTEE CHAIR JONES: Just, any questions of  
7 the members?

8 I just have one. If that city council is not  
9 willing to raise the rates then none of this goes  
10 through. We will know that in a, we have some kind of  
11 arrangement that the city is going to let us know the  
12 progress of that activity?

13 MS. BROWN: Yes, I would like to defer the  
14 answering of that question to the representative from  
15 the city.

16 MR. ORTIZ: Felix Ortiz, Public Works for the  
17 city of Exeter.

18 Actually the council has already pretty much  
19 approved that increase in rates already.

20 COMMITTEE CHAIR JONES: Because everything is  
21 predicated on that. So thank you, appreciate it.

22 Madam Chair.

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: Thank you.  
24 I'd like to move Resolution 2002-241 for the time  
25 extension for the city of Exeter, Tulare County.

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER MEDINA: Second.

2 COMMITTEE CHAIR JONES: Okay. We have a motion  
3 by Chair Linda Moulton-Patterson, a second by Mr.  
4 Medina.

5 Substitute the previous roll? Put it on  
6 consent?

7 So ordered.

8 Item P. Item P or 48.

9 MR. SCHIAVO: Okay. This is consideration of  
10 the application for an SB 1066 time extension for the  
11 city of Farmersville, Tulare County.

12 And Rebecca will be making this presentation as  
13 well.

14 MS. BROWN: The city of Farmersville submitted  
15 an SB 1066 document requesting a time extension through  
16 December 31st, 2003.

17 The city built its diversion request on -- I'm  
18 sorry, the city built its request on the 2000 diversion  
19 rate of 42 percent.

20 The city is confident that the programs  
21 outlined in its plan of correction will successfully  
22 allow them to meet or exceed the 50 percent diversion  
23 goal.

24 The specific reasons the city needs a time  
25 extension are as follows:

1           Economic development has been increasing and it  
2 is now possible to generate increased funding for solid  
3 waste and recycling programs.

4           This is making it possible for the city to  
5 enter into negotiations with the hauler to implement a  
6 curbside recycling program.

7           Should these negotiations fail, the city will  
8 go out to bid for a new contract that will include  
9 curbside recycling. This new contract will be effective  
10 July 1, 2003.

11           It will be necessary to have until December  
12 31st, 2003 to monitor the program and make any a  
13 necessary adjustments, especially if the city is unable  
14 to start it until July 1, 2003.

15           And to take the steps needed to become a member  
16 of the Consolidated Waste Management Authority regional  
17 agency whose regional programs will benefit the city.

18           Most of the implementation activity will take  
19 place in 2002 and 2003.

20           The programs listed in the plan of correction  
21 are: Expansion of special collection events, expansion  
22 of self-haul green waste, curbside collection, drop-off  
23 containers, school recycling, construction and  
24 demolition diversion, adoption of a C&D ordinance, and  
25 regional agency membership.

1           Board staff has determined that the information  
2 submitted within the application is adequately  
3 documented.

4           And based on this information, Board staff is  
5 recommending that the Board approve the time extension  
6 request for the city.

7           A representative from the city is present to  
8 answer any questions.

9           And this concludes my presentation.

10          COMMITTEE CHAIR JONES: Thanks. We have a  
11 question.

12          Mr. Eaton.

13          COMMITTEE MEMBER EATON: I had never heard of a  
14 program identified as expansion of self-haul green  
15 waste. What kind of program is that?

16          MS. BROWN: A representative of the city is  
17 here who can explain the program for you.

18          COMMITTEE MEMBER EATON: But I know that, but  
19 you're also the one who has to evaluate the program.  
20 But what would you see as a benefit to that, because to  
21 me that raises questions as to accuracy issues.

22          MS. BROWN: In terms of counting the tonnage  
23 from that?

24          COMMITTEE MEMBER EATON: Right, because that  
25 would be diversion or disposal.

1 MS. BROWN: Uh-huh.

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER EATON: So what program, what  
3 is self-haul expansion of green waste?

4 MR. MITCHELL: If I can explain that? My name  
5 is Graham Mitchell, I'm the city manager for the city of  
6 Farmersville.

7 We have many residents in our community that  
8 are yard managers or they do landscaping, and so there's  
9 a lot of self-hauling that doesn't get put into our  
10 green waste program. So the city will be offering a  
11 location out at its city yard, corporation yard, and we  
12 will accept self-haul for mulching.

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER EATON: So it's a drop-off  
14 program?

15 MR. MITCHELL: Correct.

16 COMMITTEE CHAIR JONES: Cool.

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER EATON: That makes sense.

18 COMMITTEE CHAIR JONES: That makes sense.

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER EATON: Thank you.

20 COMMITTEE CHAIR JONES: All right. Madam  
21 Chair.

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: I'd like  
23 to move Resolution 2002-242 for a time extension SB 1066  
24 for the city of Farmersville, Tulare County.

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER MEDINA: Second.

1 COMMITTEE CHAIR JONES: We have a motion by  
2 Chair Linda Moulton-Patterson, second by Mr. Medina.

3 Substitute the previous roll?

4 So ordered. And put it on consent?

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: Yes.

6 COMMITTEE CHAIR JONES: So ordered. All right.

7 We have four more of these time extensions,  
8 we'll knock these out and then we'll take a break.

9 All right, Mr. Schiavo, Q.

10 MR. SCHIAVO: Consideration of an application  
11 for an SB 1066 time extension by the unincorporated area  
12 of Monterey County.

13 And Terri Edwards will be making this  
14 presentation.

15 MS. EDWARDS: I'm Terri Edwards with the Office  
16 of Local Assistance.

17 Can you hear me?

18 COMMITTEE CHAIR JONES: No, pull that a little  
19 bit closer.

20 MS. EDWARDS: The Monterey unincorporated area  
21 submitted the SB 1066 document requesting a time  
22 extension through December 31st, 2003.

23 The county, in its plan of correction,  
24 identified a 2000 diversion rate of 33 percent which was  
25 the county's calculated rate including a disposal

1 tonnage deduction. However, upon review, Board staff  
2 have determined that this tonnage does not qualify to be  
3 deducted. Therefore, Board staff have determined that  
4 the 2000 diversion rate is 31 percent.

5           Given this difference, the county's plan of  
6 correction will achieve a total plan diversion rate of  
7 54 percent rather than the county's requested 56  
8 percent.

9           Board staff has discussed this change with the  
10 county. The county is confident that the program's  
11 outlined in its plan of correction will successfully  
12 allow them to meet or exceed the 50 percent diversion  
13 goal.

14           The specific reasons why the county needs the  
15 time extension are as follows:

16           One, to see the impact of expanded and newly  
17 implemented programs on the diversion rate.

18           Two, to complete their independent  
19 investigation on areas of needed improvement, and  
20 develop a permanent monitoring system and outreach  
21 program for potential and continuing county business  
22 diversion.

23           Three, to use the extra time to see the effects  
24 of a service agreement for trash and recycling once  
25 implemented. Implementation of this contract is

1 proposed for this year.

2 Most of the implementation activities will take  
3 place in 2002 and 2003, with monitoring taking place in  
4 the latter half of 2003.

5 Programs listed in the plan of correction are:

6 One, residential curbside collection of  
7 commingled recyclable materials from single and  
8 multi-family homes.

9 Two, commercial on-site pickup of recyclable  
10 materials. Areas of the county where garbage service is  
11 provided also have unlimited access, have access to  
12 unlimited curbside recycling collection service.

13 And three, a new franchise agreement to expand  
14 the curbside collection service for both residential and  
15 commercial sectors.

16 And four, recycling collection at special  
17 events at the county's raceway.

18 Board staff has determined that the information  
19 submitted within the application is adequately  
20 documented.

21 Based on this information, Board staff is  
22 roaming that the Board approve the time extension  
23 request for the county.

24 Representatives from the county and Board staff  
25 are present to answer any questions.

1 And this concludes my presentation.

2 COMMITTEE CHAIR JONES: Questions? Mr. Eaton.

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER EATON: I move that we adopt  
4 Resolution 2002-243, extension of time to the  
5 unincorporated area of Monterey County.

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: Second.

7 COMMITTEE CHAIR JONES: Okay. We had a motion  
8 by Mr. Eaton, and a second by Chair Linda Moulton-  
9 Patterson.

10 Substitute the previous roll? Put it on  
11 consent?

12 So ordered. R.

13 MR. SCHIAVO: R is consideration of the  
14 application for an SB 1066 time extension by the city of  
15 Antioch, Contra Costa County.

16 And this presentation will be made by Eric  
17 Bissinger.

18 MR. BISSINGER: Good morning. The city of  
19 Antioch has submitted an SB 1066 application requesting  
20 a time extension until December 31st, 2003.

21 The city plans to increase their existing 2000  
22 diversion rate of 45 percent, and is confident that the  
23 programs outlined in its plan of correction will  
24 successfully allow them to meet or exceed the 50 percent  
25 goal.

1           The specific reasons why this agency needs a  
2 time extension is as follows:

3           One, to reconcile delays in facility  
4 development.

5           Two, time is needed for programs to become  
6 fully implemented and the success of the programs  
7 realized.

8           And three, now with the recently approved new  
9 base year, newly targeted programs are more realistic  
10 and can be done with more accurate results.

11           Many of the implementation activities have  
12 begun and monitoring is expected to take place.

13           The programs listed in the plan of corrections  
14 are:

15           The city's hauler will begin to sort mixed  
16 loads of C&D at the transfer station.

17           Two, expansion of material types collected at  
18 the residential curbside program.

19           Three, establishment of a variable can rate.

20           Four, restructuring the recycling rates and  
21 encouraging businesses to divert materials.

22           And through increasing recycling opportunities  
23 in public areas.

24           Board staff has determined that the information  
25 submitted within the application is adequately

1 documented.

2 Based on this information, Board staff is  
3 recommending that the Board approve the time extension  
4 request for the agency.

5 The city is here to answer any questions.

6 COMMITTEE CHAIR JONES: Any questions of  
7 members?

8 I just, would the city, whoever is here from  
9 the city and you don't have to come up -- you don't have  
10 to come up.

11 You're 45 percent, you've got great programs  
12 that you've listed for your extension, your city should  
13 be commended. I mean that's thinking. I mean that  
14 makes a lot of sense and we appreciate it.

15 Who would like to make this motion?

16 Mr. Medina.

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER MEDINA: Chair Jones, I'd like  
18 to move Resolution 2002-244, a 1066 time extension  
19 approval for the city of Antioch, Contra Costa county.

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER EATON: I'll second.

21 COMMITTEE CHAIR JONES: Okay. We've got a  
22 motion by Mr. Medina, second by Mr. Eaton.

23 Substitute the previous roll?

24 So done. Put it on consent?

25 So ordered.

1           Item number 51, S.

2           MR. SCHIAVO: This is consideration of the  
3 application for an SB 1066 time extension by the city of  
4 Orinda, Contra Costa County.

5           And Eric will be making this presentation.

6           MR. BISSINGER: Hello again. The city of  
7 Orinda submitted a 1066 document requesting a time  
8 extension until December 31st, 2003.

9           The city plans to increase their existing 2000  
10 diversion rate of 44 percent, and is confident that the  
11 programs outlined in the plan of correction will  
12 successfully allow them to meet or exceed the program  
13 goal of 50 percent.

14           The specific reasons why this agency needs a  
15 time extension are as follows:

16           One, the economy booze -- boom caused residents  
17 and businesses to renovate existing buildings and homes  
18 which increased construction and demolition rates.

19           Two, time is needed for programs to be fully  
20 implemented and the successes of the programs realized.

21           Three, additional time is needed to implement  
22 programs that will target residential and  
23 non-residential food waste.

24           Most of the implementation activities will take  
25 place in the first two years with monitoring taking

1 place in the third.

2 The programs listed in the plan of correction  
3 are:

4 One, the city will begin the residential and  
5 non-residential food waste collection.

6 The city approved the C&D recycling regulation  
7 in December, 2000; therefore, this program needs to  
8 mature and realize diversion credits.

9 Three, expand curbside collection.

10 Four, district-wide recycling program.

11 And five, begin sorting through selected loads.

12 Board staff has determined that the information  
13 submitted within the application is adequately  
14 documented.

15 And based on this information, Board staff is  
16 requesting that the Board approve this time extension  
17 for the city of Orinda.

18 COMMITTEE CHAIR JONES: Thanks. Any questions  
19 from members?

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER EATON: Just a comment that I  
21 think if, it would be worthy to note that this is one of  
22 the few examples where a local school district and the  
23 waste authority have combined, if you look at the stuff  
24 they've got, they've got tracking systems, they've got  
25 everything, and this is really one of the examples where

1 I think, and there are a lot of factors that go into it,  
2 but where an education component of the community can  
3 really be beneficial. Even though it's only five  
4 schools and it's easier to work with than some of the  
5 larger school districts, but it is a way they can get  
6 stuff moving.

7 COMMITTEE CHAIR JONES: Absolutely. And I  
8 think from the city to the city of Orinda the same  
9 comments. I mean the food waste composting and those  
10 types of things, I know there's a lot of jurisdictions  
11 who are afraid to even go down that road. But  
12 congratulations.

13 Mr. Eaton.

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER EATON: I'll move that we  
15 adopt Resolution 2002-246 granting the extension to the  
16 city of Orinda, Contra Costa County.

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: Second.

18 COMMITTEE CHAIR JONES: Okay. We've got a  
19 motion by Mr. Eaton and a second by Chair  
20 Moulton-Patterson.

21 Substitute the previous roll? Put it on  
22 consent?

23 So ordered. All right.

24 Item number 52, which is P. And then after  
25 this we're going to take a break.

1           MR. SCHIAVO: This is consideration of the  
2 application for an SB 1066 alternative diversion  
3 requirement by the city of Guadalupe, Santa Barbara  
4 County.

5           And Nikki Mizwinsky will be making this  
6 presentation.

7           MS. MIZWINSKY: Good morning, Chairman and  
8 committee members.

9           The city of Guadalupe submitted a 1066  
10 application requesting an alternative diversion  
11 requirement of 46 percent through December, 2002.

12          The city built its alternative diversion  
13 requirement request off of the existing diversion rate  
14 of 38 percent.

15          The city requested an alternative diversion  
16 requirement in lieu of a time extension because the city  
17 believes that despite its good faith efforts it will be  
18 unable to meet the 50 percent goal.

19          The city has been having difficulties reaching  
20 50 percent because it is a small, rural, economically  
21 challenged community with only 60 businesses.

22          The specific reasons why the city is requesting  
23 the alternative diversion requirement are as follows:

24          The city had been locked into a franchise  
25 agreement prior to the year 2001, and was limited in its

1 ability to negotiate new programs. However, when the  
2 city contracted with its new hauler, it was able to  
3 leverage new programs.

4 The additional time will also allow the city's  
5 new franchise hauler time to implement the program  
6 expansions that will target the city's residential waste  
7 stream.

8 In order to meet the self-imposed alternative  
9 diversion requirement, deadline that is December of  
10 2002, the following programs have been selected in the  
11 city's goal achievement plan:

12 The expansion of residential curbside  
13 collection of recyclables and of green waste.

14 The expansion of commercial on-site collection  
15 of recyclables.

16 The expansion of the wood waste diversion  
17 program that targets TrussPro, the city's third largest  
18 business.

19 And residential and commercial outreach which  
20 has already begun.

21 Board staff has determined that the information  
22 submitted within the application is adequately  
23 documented.

24 Based on this information, Board staff is  
25 recommending that the Board approve the alternative

1 diversion requirement of 46 percent requested by the  
2 city.

3 The city's representative is present to answer  
4 any questions.

5 Thank you, this concludes my presentation.

6 COMMITTEE CHAIR JONES: Any questions of the  
7 members?

8 I have, I want to congratulate Guadalupe. They  
9 were here four or five years ago for a whole different  
10 set of circumstances, and it's good to see them respond  
11 and come forward with these kind of numbers and new  
12 programs.

13 So I'd like, if the members don't mind, to move  
14 adoption of Resolution 2002-248 for the alternative  
15 diversion for the city of Guadalupe in Santa Barbara  
16 County.

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER MEDINA: Second.

18 CHAIRPERSON: We have a motion by Jones, a  
19 second by Mr. Medina.

20 Substitute the previous roll?

21 So done. Put it on consent.

22 Okay. We're going to take a break until ten  
23 minutes to 11:00.

24 (Thereupon there was a brief recess.)

25 COMMITTEE CHAIR JONES: We're going to call the

1 committee back to order.

2 Any members have ex-parte? No.

3 I have one, John Cupps. We were just talking  
4 about some diversion programs.

5 Mr. Schiavo, we are on item number 53, U.

6 MR. SCHIAVO: Okay. This is consideration of  
7 the 1999-2000 biennial review findings for the city of  
8 Palm Desert, Riverside County.

9 And Melissa Vargas will be making this  
10 presentation.

11 MS. VARGAS: Good morning, Chairman and  
12 committee members.

13 The city of Palm Desert submitted their 1999  
14 and 2000 annual reports with a request for diversion  
15 credit for biomass for the 2000 reporting year.

16 The review of the item included an analysis of  
17 the biomass facility diversion claimed in the  
18 application, a review of the city's diversion program  
19 development, and diversion rates.

20 Staff has conducted a biennial review and found  
21 that the city of Palm Desert has achieved a 2000 default  
22 diversion rate of 52 percent.

23 They have submitted their request for biomass  
24 diversion for 39,147 tons, of which 17,982 tons are  
25 allowable under statute which limits the amount of

1 biomass credit to no more than ten percent of the  
2 reporting year generation.

3 If approved, the city's new diversion rate will  
4 be 62 percent.

5 The city of Palm Desert is adequately  
6 implementing source reduction, recycling, composting,  
7 public education, and information programs as outlined  
8 in their source reduction and recycling element.

9 In addition, the staff conducted a site visit  
10 and verified that the city's diversion program  
11 implementation is effective.

12 Because the city has demonstrated it is  
13 adequately implementing its SRRE and HHWE, and has met  
14 the 50 percent diversion requirement, and has documented  
15 that it meets the conditions for claiming biomass  
16 diversion in 2000, staff recommends the Board approve  
17 the biennial review and request for biomass diversion  
18 credit.

19 A representative from the city of Palm Desert  
20 is present to answer any questions.

21 This concludes my presentation.

22 COMMITTEE CHAIR JONES: Any questions from the  
23 members?

24 Mr. Eaton.

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER EATON: I just move that we

1 adopt Resolution 2002-249.

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: Second.

3 COMMITTEE CHAIR JONES: We have a motion by Mr.

4 Eaton, a second by Chair Linda Moulton-Patterson.

5 Go ahead and call the roll, and we'll

6 reestablish.

7 COMMITTEE SECRETARY BAKULICH: Eaton?

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER EATON: Aye. No ex partes.

9 COMMITTEE SECRETARY BAKULICH: Medina?

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER MEDINA: Aye.

11 COMMITTEE SECRETARY BAKULICH: Moulton-

12 Patterson?

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER ROBERTI: Aye.

14 COMMITTEE SECRETARY BAKULICH: Jones?

15 COMMITTEE CHAIR JONES: Aye. And we'll put  
16 this on consent.

17 Thank you.

18 Madam Chair, any ex-partes?

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: No, I  
20 don't have any.

21 COMMITTEE CHAIR JONES: Okay. Thank you.

22 Mr. Schiavo, number 54.

23 MR. SCHIAVO: 54, V, is consideration of the  
24 1999-2000 biennial review findings for the Kings Waste  
25 and Recycling Authority, Kings County.

1           And Rebecca Brown will be making this  
2 presentation.

3           MS. BROWN: The regional agency's diversion  
4 rate for 1999 is 45 percent, and for 2000 is 49 percent.

5           To determine the level of source reduction and  
6 recycling element and household hazardous waste element  
7 implementation, staff completed the following:

8           They analyzed the historic diversion rate trend  
9 which has been trending upward for the last three years.

10          Reviewed program implementation.

11          And conducted a program verification site  
12 visit.

13          Both the jurisdiction's programs and staff  
14 analysis of these programs can be found in detail in  
15 attachment two.

16          Some of the major programs that have been  
17 implemented include, residential curbside green waste  
18 collection, residential and commercial self-haul green  
19 waste, residential drop-off, commercial on-site  
20 collection, prison and municipal government recycling,  
21 materials recovery facility, inert recycling, and  
22 composting.

23          Staff recommends that the Board find that Kings  
24 Waste and Recycling Authority has made a good faith  
25 effort in meeting the diversion requirements.

1           A representative of the regional agency is  
2 present to answer any questions.

3           And this concludes my presentation.

4           COMMITTEE CHAIR JONES: Mr. Eaton.

5           COMMITTEE MEMBER EATON: I have a question for  
6 legal. What are we being asked to do here? Are we  
7 being asked that since they're at 49 percent say that  
8 they've reached 50 percent?

9           LEGAL COUNSEL BLOCK: No, we're being asked --

10          COMMITTEE MEMBER EATON: Because they haven't  
11 reserved a right for an extension, so I want to know,  
12 this is the first one that's popped up like this.

13          LEGAL COUNSEL BLOCK: Actually --

14          COMMITTEE MEMBER EATON: We're at 49, right?

15          LEGAL COUNSEL BLOCK: Yes.

16          COMMITTEE MEMBER EATON: So what, what --

17          LEGAL COUNSEL BLOCK: This is the finding for  
18 good faith efforts to meet the goal. We did have an  
19 item last month, I believe the city of Beverly Hills  
20 which was at 47 percent.

21          But yeah, if you look at the way the resolution  
22 is worded, it's specifically finding that the Board  
23 determines that they've made a good faith effort to meet  
24 the requirements, not that they have met 50 percent per  
25 se.

1 COMMITTEE CHAIR JONES: Okay. All right. And  
2 before I turn it over to Chair Patterson. This was one  
3 of the jurisdictions that had to work through a prior  
4 compliance order?

5 MS. BROWN: Yes.

6 COMMITTEE CHAIR JONES: They had built a MRF, a  
7 lot of material wasn't going to the MRF, they were, I  
8 know, not very happy with us when we put 'em on a  
9 compliance order until after they put their programs  
10 together and got more cooperation.

11 And I just want to congratulate you on, you  
12 know, what you've gotten to so far. And I know that  
13 it's going to keep increasing.

14 So this, Madam Chair.

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: Thank you,  
16 Chairman Jones. I just also wanted to say  
17 congratulations. I know Heidi Sanborn, my technical  
18 advisor, worked very closely with you and says that  
19 you've worked really hard.

20 And with that, I'd like to move 2002-250 for  
21 Kings County.

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER MEDINA: Second.

23 COMMITTEE CHAIR JONES: Okay. And a second by  
24 Mr. Medina. A motion by Chair Linda Moulton-Patterson,  
25 a second by Mr. Medina.

1           Substitute the previous roll, Mr. Eaton?

2           COMMITTEE MEMBER EATON:   Sure.

3           COMMITTEE CHAIR JONES:   Okay.   We're going to  
4   substitute the previous roll if there's no objection,  
5   and we will put it on consent.

6           Thanks.   Thank you.   All right.

7           Mr. Schiavo, number 55, W.

8           MR. SCHIAVO:   This is consideration of the  
9   1999-2000 biennial review findings for the city of Sand  
10   City, Monterey County.

11           And Terri Edwards will be making this  
12   presentation.

13           MS. EDWARDS:   Members of the Board, the city's  
14   diversion rate for 1999 is 45 percent, and for 2000 it's  
15   48 percent.

16           To determine the level of source reduction and  
17   recycling element and household hazardous waste element  
18   implementation, staff completed the following:

19           Analyzed the historic diversion rate trend for  
20   the city which has been trending upward for the last,  
21   upward towards 50 percent in the last four years.

22           Reviewed program implementation.

23           And conducted a program verification site  
24   visit.

25           Both the jurisdiction's programs and staff

1 analysis of these programs can be found in detail in  
2 attachment two.

3 Some of the major programs that have been  
4 implemented include residential curbside recycling  
5 collection, commercial on-site collection, residential  
6 drop-off and buy back, xeriscaping ordinance, wood waste  
7 drop-off, residential and commercial self-haul green  
8 waste drop-off, and concrete and asphalt drop-off.

9 Staff recommends that the Board finds that the  
10 city has made a good faith effort in meeting the  
11 diversion rate requirements.

12 Representatives of the city are present to  
13 answer any questions, as well as Board staff.

14 This concludes my presentation.

15 COMMITTEE CHAIR JONES: Any questions of the  
16 members?

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: I have a  
18 question. What's the population?

19 MS. EDWARDS: 200.

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: 200,  
21 uh-huh. I'm just trying to get a view of -- do they  
22 have auto dealerships there?

23 MS. EDWARDS: They have one, one that I know  
24 of.

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: I'm trying

1 to get kind of a --

2 MS. EDWARDS: One that I know of.

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: -- view of  
4 the city, because I had some experience when I was on  
5 the Coastal Commission and I just am trying to get a  
6 picture of what the city consists of.

7 There's 200 people, one auto dealership?

8 MS. EDWARDS: Yeah, it's mostly commercial, and  
9 there are some residences, and that population is  
10 growing, it continues to grow. But it's mostly  
11 commercial at this point. It's 98 percent commercial.

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: And  
13 they're working with the dealership on the commercial?

14 MS. EDWARDS: I don't know that they're  
15 addressing the dealership at this time, but they have  
16 targeted what, they conducted a diversion rate, a waste  
17 generation study in 1999 and discovered that the major  
18 waste generators were big retail businesses that have  
19 lots of cardboard, and so they've been, in their  
20 analysis they found out that these were the major waste  
21 generators, and they were targeting that portion of the  
22 waste stream.

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: Okay.

24 Thank you.

25 COMMITTEE CHAIR JONES: All right. Do I hear a

1 motion?

2 Mr. Medina.

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER MEDINA: I'd like to move  
4 Resolution 2002-251, approval of the 1999-2000 biennial  
5 review findings for the source reduction and recycling  
6 element and household hazardous waste element for the  
7 city of Sand City, Monterey County.

8 COMMITTEE CHAIR JONES: Okay, I'll second.

9 We've got a motion by Mr. Medina, a second by  
10 Jones.

11 Substitute the following -- the previous roll  
12 and put it on consent?

13 So done. All right.

14 Item number 56, X.

15 MR. SCHIAVO: This is consideration of the  
16 1999-2000 source reduction recycling element for the  
17 city of Del Rey Oaks, Monterey County.

18 And this will be presented by Terri Edwards as  
19 well.

20 MS. EDWARDS: The city's diversion rate for  
21 1999 is 39 percent, and for 2000 it's 48 percent.

22 To determine the level of source reduction and  
23 recycling element and household hazardous waste element  
24 implementation, staff completed the following:

25 Analyzed the historic diversion rate trend for

1 the city which has been trending upward in the last,  
2 towards 50 percent in the last four years.

3 Reviewed program implementation.

4 And conducted a program verification site  
5 visit.

6 Both the jurisdiction's programs and the staff  
7 analysis of these programs can be found in detail in  
8 attachment two.

9 Some of the major programs that have been  
10 implemented include residential curbside recycling  
11 collection, residential and commercial self-haul green  
12 waste collection, residential drop-off and buy back,  
13 commercial on-site pickup, wood waste drop-off, concrete  
14 and asphalt drop-off, and food waste composting.

15 Staff recommends that the Board find that the  
16 city has made good faith efforts in meeting the  
17 diversion requirements.

18 Representatives of the city and Board staff are  
19 present to answer any questions.

20 And this concludes staff's presentation.

21 COMMITTEE CHAIR JONES: Any questions?

22 Mr. Medina.

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER MEDINA: Chair Jones, I'd like  
24 to move Resolution 2002-252, approval of the '99-2000  
25 biennial review findings for the source reduction and

1 recycling element and household hazardous waste element  
2 for the city of Del Rey Oaks, Monterey County.

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: Second.

4 COMMITTEE CHAIR JONES: I've got a motion by  
5 Mr. Medina, second by Chair Moulton-Patterson.

6 Substitute the previous roll? On consent?

7 So ordered.

8 Item number Y, 57.

9 MR. SCHIAVO: This is consideration of the  
10 1999-2000 biennial review findings for the city of  
11 Moraga, Contra Costa County.

12 And Eric Bissinger will be making this  
13 presentation.

14 MR. BISSINGER: Hello again. The city's  
15 diversion rate for '99-2000 is 49 percent. The city did  
16 surpass the 50 percent goal with the CIWMB accepted  
17 diversion rate of 53 percent in 1997, and 55 percent in  
18 1998.

19 Moraga has implemented alternative programs in  
20 addition to all source reduction and recycling element  
21 selection programs. All programs have been implemented  
22 and none have been dropped.

23 To determine the level of source reduction and  
24 recycling element and household hazardous waste element  
25 program implementation, staff completed the following:

1           Analyze the historic diversion rate which has  
2   been consistently around the 50 percent mark.

3           Reviewed program implementation.

4           And conducted a program verification site  
5   visit.

6           Both the jurisdiction's programs and staff  
7   analysis of these programs can be found in detail in  
8   attachment two.

9           Some of the major programs that have been  
10   implemented include residential curbside green waste and  
11   recycling collection with high participation rates,  
12   reasonable bulky item collections, permitted commercial  
13   recycling haulers, C&D recycling plan regulations,  
14   school recycling and curriculum programs, recycling  
15   centers and drop-offs and buy backs -- excuse me,  
16   recycling centers for drop-off and buy back, extensive  
17   outreach and education programs, backyard composting  
18   workshops and incentives, and internal governmental  
19   recycle programs.

20           Staff recommends that the Board find the city  
21   of Moraga has made a good faith effort in meeting  
22   diversion requirements.

23           This concludes my presentation. And  
24   representatives from the city of Moraga are here.

25           COMMITTEE CHAIR JONES: Questions?

1 Mr. Medina.

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER MEDINA: Chair Jones, I'd like  
3 to move Resolution 2002-245, approval of the '99-2000  
4 biennial review findings for the source reduction and  
5 recycling element and household hazardous waste element  
6 for the town of Moraga, Contra Costa County.

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: Second.

8 COMMITTEE CHAIR JONES: We have a motion by Mr.  
9 Medina, second by Chair Moulton-Patterson.

10 Substitute the previous roll? And on consent?

11 So ordered.

12 COMMITTEE CHAIR JONES: Item A, number -- let's  
13 see, big A little A.

14 MR. SCHIAVO: Z.

15 COMMITTEE CHAIR JONES: Z, thank you. Is it  
16 Z?

17 MR. SCHIAVO: No.

18 COMMITTEE CHAIR JONES: Okay, whatever. You  
19 know which one?

20 MR. SCHIAVO: Yes.

21 COMMITTEE CHAIR JONES: Cool, go.

22 MR. SCHIAVO: AA on the Board agenda. This is  
23 consideration of the 1999-2000 biennial review findings  
24 for the city of Rancho Palos Verdes, Los Angeles County.  
25 And Primitivo Nunez will be making this presentation.

1           MR. NUNEZ: Good morning, committee members.  
2 My name is Primitivo Nunez of the Los Angeles Local  
3 Assistance Section.

4           The item before you is staff's analysis for the  
5 city of Rancho Palos Verdes' progress in achieving  
6 diversion goals, and the city's effort to implement  
7 programs described in the SRRE or suitable alternatives.

8           Staff brings this item forward as a city that  
9 is implementing all SRRE selected programs but not  
10 meeting the diversion goals.

11          To determine the level of SRRE implementation,  
12 staff reviewed:

13          The Board approved base year study for 1999.

14          The adjustment method diversion rate  
15 calculation for '99 and 2000;

16          The 2000 annual report submitted by the city;

17          A review of program implementation documented  
18 in PARIS;

19          And a verification site visit.

20          Staff findings infer additional alternatives  
21 have been implemented to reinforce the SRRE selected  
22 programs, and major program efforts to achieve the  
23 city's current diversion rate that include commingled  
24 residential curbside recycling collection, curbside  
25 green waste collection, commercial on-site collection,

1 city tree trimmings that are used for mulch on city  
2 grounds, and a procurement program.

3 I'd like to highlight that the city has a  
4 recycler of the month award in which two residents are  
5 awarded \$250 from the city for their recycling efforts.

6 The city was able to take advantage of the  
7 maximum ten percent diversion credit in 2000.

8 Staff recommends the Board find that the city  
9 has made a good faith effort in meeting diversion  
10 requirements.

11 The city has reserved the right to submit a  
12 time extension depending on the Board's determination.

13 A city representative is present and available  
14 to answer any questions on the specific program  
15 implementation.

16 And this concludes my presentation. Thank you.

17 COMMITTEE CHAIR JONES: Any questions?

18 Motion, Mr. Medina?

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER MEDINA: Yes, I'd like to move  
20 Resolution 2002-254, approval of the 1999-2000 biennial  
21 review findings for the source reduction and recycling  
22 element and household hazardous waste element for the  
23 city of Rancho Palos Verdes, Los Angeles County.

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: Second.

25 COMMITTEE CHAIR JONES: We have a motion by Mr.

1 Medina, second by Chair Linda Moulton-Patterson.

2 Substitute the previous roll, put it on  
3 consent.

4 Thank you. So ordered.

5 Item number 59 or AA.

6 MR. SCHIAVO: Okay. This is consideration of  
7 the 1999-2000 biennial review findings for the city of  
8 Calabasas, Los Angeles County.

9 And Jennifer Wallin will be making this  
10 presentation.

11 MS. WALLIN: Good morning, Board members.  
12 Jennifer Wallin with the Office of Local Assistance, Los  
13 Angeles section.

14 The item before you is staff's analysis of the  
15 city of Calabasas' progress in achieving diversion  
16 goals, and the city's efforts to implement programs  
17 described in its source reduction and recycling element  
18 or the implementation of suitable alternatives.

19 Staff brings this item forward as a city that's  
20 implementing most of its SRRE selected programs but is  
21 not meeting diversion goals.

22 To determine the level of SRRE implementation,  
23 staff reviewed:

24 The adjustment method diversion rate  
25 calculation for 1999 and 2000 and found the rates to be

1 35 and 46 percent respectively.

2           The historic diversion rate for this city, and  
3 found the rate to have an increasing trend towards 50  
4 percent in the last three years since the city's 1997  
5 base year was approved.

6           The 2000 annual report submitted by the city.

7           A review of program and implementation  
8 documented in PARIS.

9           And a verification site visit.

10          Staff findings indicate suitable alternatives  
11 have been implemented for the city's two drop programs.  
12 Details of staff analysis are provided in attachment two  
13 of this item.

14          Major program efforts to achieve the city's  
15 current diversion rate include commingled curbside  
16 residential and recycling collection, curbside green  
17 waste collection, commercial on-site collection with  
18 mandatory participation by ordinance, a tracking system  
19 for construction and demolition waste generated in the  
20 city, recycling programs at local schools, and a city  
21 procurement policy.

22          The city's base year was updated in 1997 to  
23 reflect changes in the city's disposal since its  
24 incorporation in 1991.

25          The apparent increase in generation waste could

1 be attributed to the amount of light industrial  
2 businesses and several large distributors that relocated  
3 to the city during the period 1997 through 1999.

4 As this trend continued after approval of the  
5 base year in 1997, the increase in business activity has  
6 increased the cost of person per day in the generation  
7 amount of 22 pounds per person per day in the base year  
8 to nearly 31 pounds in the year 2000.

9 Staff's overall analysis of the SRRE and  
10 household hazardous waste implementation determined the  
11 city has made all reasonable and feasible efforts to  
12 implement its selected programs.

13 Staff recommends that the Board find the city  
14 has made a good faith effort in meeting diversion  
15 requirements.

16 The jurisdiction has reserved the right to  
17 submit a time extension depending on the Board's  
18 determination.

19 A representative for the city is present to  
20 provide the Board with additional program specific  
21 implementation that is occurring within the city.

22 This concludes staff's presentation.

23 COMMITTEE CHAIR JONES: I have a question, if I  
24 could. We've got a generation rate of almost 31 pounds  
25 per person per day, and they're saying it went from 22

1 to 31 based on some new what, retail business or  
2 wholesale.

3 MR. USELTON: It's light manufacturing and also  
4 some of these warehousing facilities. We did ask the  
5 city to be prepared to discuss the specifics of that  
6 waste generation, and if it pleases the Board we'd like  
7 to have them come up.

8 COMMITTEE CHAIR JONES: Yeah, I mean I'd like  
9 to know how they got to 22, I mean that would be the  
10 first question, let alone how they got to 31.

11 MS. NIELSON: Hi, my name is Kimberly Nielson.

12 COMMITTEE CHAIR JONES: Next one over.  
13 Beautiful, thank you.

14 MS. NIELSON: My name is Kimberly Nielson, I'm  
15 here to represent the city of Calabasas. I've been the  
16 solid waste coordinator for the last four years.

17 The city of Calabasas has grown tremendously.  
18 Light commercial, light industrial-wise. We are the  
19 home for many of these new Internet corporations, and  
20 they've made their home in our community. Most of these  
21 people do not live there, so they come in and they work.

22 And we have done a series of waste audits with  
23 the help of the staff, Cara Morgan and the Office of  
24 Local Assistance to see what they are doing.

25 We have mandatory commercial recycling programs

1 that they're all participating in. But we have a city  
2 of immense growth commercially, not residentially at  
3 this point. We have a new BMW dealer coming in, and a  
4 huge hotel that's going to come in within the next six  
5 months.

6           So our trend is going to continue, I would  
7 think, for the next three to four years that this will  
8 happen. And because this is such a transient  
9 population, they're not living in our community, they're  
10 just working there, and we're not building any more  
11 homes, our pounds are quite high in comparison to other  
12 jurisdictions in our area.

13           COMMITTEE CHAIR JONES: Okay. All right.  
14 That's reasonable for now. I mean we get to look at  
15 this every two years, so -- but it scares me because  
16 that is, that's a high pounds per person per day.

17           The city, the residential part of the city is  
18 it basically suburban, row homes, big lots, little  
19 lots?

20           MS. NIELSON: It's, I would say 85 percent  
21 gated communities, big lots.

22           COMMITTEE CHAIR JONES: Big lots. A lot of  
23 generation of green waste?

24           MS. NIELSON: Yes, we do have a mandatory green  
25 waste program, and we work with the landscapers for

1 participation in that also.

2 COMMITTEE CHAIR JONES: Okay.

3 MS. NIELSON: The city is relooking at all of  
4 their, right now they're on a permit system, and within  
5 the next six months they're going to decide if they're  
6 going to franchise, so that's being looked at.

7 And we're also looking at having the haulers  
8 report to us separately, the residential and commercial,  
9 so we can more attack the commercial base and make sure  
10 that they are implementing everything that we're  
11 requesting.

12 COMMITTEE CHAIR JONES: Big lots and  
13 industrial, that makes me a little bit more comfortable,  
14 you know.

15 So any questions? Motion?

16 Mr. Medina.

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER MEDINA: I'd like to move  
18 Resolution 2002-255, approval of the 1999-2000 biennial  
19 review findings for the source reduction and recycling  
20 element and household hazardous waste element for the  
21 city of Calabasas, Los Angeles County.

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: Second.

23 COMMITTEE CHAIR JONES: We have a motion by Mr.  
24 Medina, and a second by Chair Linda Moulton-Patterson.

25 Substitute the previous roll? Put it on

1 consent?

2 So ordered.

3 Item 60, AB.

4 MR. SCHIAVO: AB, consideration of the  
5 1999-2000 biennial review findings for the city of West  
6 Hollywood, Los Angeles.

7 And Jennifer will be making this presentation.

8 MS. WALLIN: Jennifer Wallin, Office of Local  
9 Assistance.

10 The item before you is staff's analysis of the  
11 city of West Hollywood's progress in achieving diversion  
12 goals, and the city's efforts to implement programs  
13 described in its source reduction and recycling element,  
14 or the implementation of suitable alternatives.

15 Staff brings this item forward as a city that's  
16 implementing most of its SRRE selected programs, but is  
17 not meeting its diversion goals.

18 To determine the level of SRRE implementation,  
19 the staff reviewed:

20 The adjustment method diversion rate  
21 calculation for 1999 and 2000, and found the rates to be  
22 32 and 46 percent respectively.

23 The historic diversion rate for this city, and  
24 found the rate to be above 50 percent for the two years  
25 prior to this biennial review.

1           The 2000 annual report submitted by the city.

2           And review of program implementation documented  
3 in PARIS.

4           Staff findings indicate suitable alternatives  
5 have been implemented for the city's one drop program.

6           Details of staff's analysis are provided in  
7 attachment two of this item.

8           Major program efforts to achieve the city's  
9 current diversion rate include.

10          Curbside residential recycling collection,  
11 including an aggressive program for multi-family  
12 residences.

13          Curbside green waste collection for all  
14 residences.

15          Commercial on-site recycling collection.

16          Also we reviewed demolition debris recycling  
17 plans for demolition projects.

18          Vermicomposting at local schools.

19          And a city procurement policy that follows the  
20 guidelines required by the state agency Buy Recycled  
21 campaign.

22          A large county-sponsored sewer reconstruction  
23 project took place in the city during 1998 and continued  
24 to the year 2000. A significant portion of this waste  
25 was disposed.

1           As a result of the sewer reconstruction  
2 project, the city worked closely with the contractor to  
3 encourage waste diversion from a large city-sponsored  
4 street reconstruction project undertaken on the same  
5 boulevard during 1999 through 2001.

6           Much of the material excavated from the site  
7 was recycled or otherwise diverted. In 2000 the city  
8 reported that 90 percent of inert project waste was  
9 diverted. Almost 190,000 tons of material were diverted  
10 from the project overall.

11          Staff's overall analysis of the source  
12 reduction and recycling element and household hazardous  
13 waste element implementation indicates that the city has  
14 made all reasonable and feasible effort to implement its  
15 selected programs.

16          Staff recommends that the Board find the city  
17 has made a good faith effort in meeting diversion  
18 requirements.

19          The jurisdiction has reserved the right to  
20 submit a time extension depending on the Board's  
21 determination.

22          Representatives for the city are present and  
23 can provide the Board with any additional details,  
24 specific program implementation that is occurring within  
25 the city.

1 This concludes staff's presentation.

2 COMMITTEE CHAIR JONES: Any questions of  
3 staff?

4 Mr. Medina.

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER MEDINA: Mr. Jones, I'd like  
6 to move Resolution 2002-256, approval of the '99-2000  
7 biennial review findings for the source reduction and  
8 recycling element and household hazardous waste element  
9 for the city of West Hollywood, Los Angeles County.

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: Second.

11 COMMITTEE CHAIR JONES: We have a motion by Mr.  
12 Medina, a second by Chair Linda Moulton-Patterson.

13 Substitute the previous roll and put it on  
14 consent?

15 So ordered.

16 Item 61, AC.

17 MR. SCHIAVO: Consideration of the 1999-2000  
18 biennial review findings for the city of Diamond Bar,  
19 Los Angeles County.

20 And Jennifer will be making this presentation.

21 MS. WALLIN: The item before you is staff's  
22 analysis of the city of Diamond Bar's progress in  
23 achieving diversion goals, and the city's efforts to  
24 implement programs described in its source reduction and  
25 recycling element.

1           Staff brings this item forward as the city is  
2   implementing all of its SRRE selected programs, but is  
3   not meeting diversion goals.

4           To determine the level of SRRE implementation,  
5   staff reviewed:

6           The adjusted method diversion rate method  
7   calculation for 1999 and 2000, and found the rates to be  
8   27 and 48 percent respectively.

9           Then the historic diversion rate for the city.

10          The 2000 annual report submitted by the city.

11          A review of program implementation documented  
12   in PARIS.

13          Staff findings indicate that all the SREE  
14   selected programs have been implemented. Details of  
15   staff analysis are provided in attachment two of this  
16   item.

17          Major program efforts to achieve the city's  
18   current diversion rate include:

19          Mandatory curbside residential recycling  
20   collection;

21          Curbside green waste collection for  
22   single-family residences;

23          Commercial on-site recycling collection, and  
24   commercial businesses are subject to the city's ban on  
25   the disposal of regularly recyclable material which is

1 also applied towards the residences;

2 A 50 percent diversion requirement for  
3 contractors and demonstration of best management  
4 practices demolition projects;

5 Grasscycling at local schools and throughout  
6 the community;

7 And a city procurement ordinance that  
8 stipulates the usage of recycled products when feasible.

9 Staff's overall analysis of the source  
10 reduction and recycling element and household hazardous  
11 waste element indicates that the city has made all  
12 reasonable and feasible efforts to implement its  
13 selected programs.

14 Staff recommends the Board find the city has  
15 made a good faith effort in meeting diversion  
16 requirements.

17 The jurisdiction has reserved the right to  
18 submit a time extension depending on the Board's  
19 determination.

20 A representative of the city is present.

21 This concludes staff's presentation.

22 COMMITTEE CHAIR JONES: I just have one quick  
23 question.

24 Did the jump coincide with when the Perez  
25 Brothers MRF came on-line in Diamond Bar? Is that part

1 of why the jump happened?

2 MR. USELTON: I wouldn't be able to speak to  
3 the Perez MRF, but it did coincide with the enhancements  
4 in the collection programs.

5 COMMITTEE CHAIR JONES: Okay. I thought the  
6 timing was about then.

7 Mr. Medina.

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER MEDINA: Mr. Jones, I'd like  
9 to move Resolution 2002-257, approval of the 1999-2000  
10 biennial review findings for the source reduction and  
11 recycling element and household hazardous waste element  
12 for the city of Diamond Bar, Los Angeles County.

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: Second.

14 COMMITTEE CHAIR JONES: We've got a motion by  
15 Mr. Medina, a second by Chairwoman Linda  
16 Moulton-Patterson.

17 Substitute the previous roll?

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER EATON: Aye.

19 COMMITTEE CHAIR JONES: Put it on consent?

20 Okay. Done.

21 Item number 62, AD.

22 MR. SCHIAVO: Okay, that's been pulled.

23 COMMITTEE CHAIR JONES: Oh, I'm sorry, I'm  
24 going off the wrong sheet here.

25 Okay, 62 has been pulled. Better turn the

1 pages to make sure I don't make another mistake here.

2 Okay. Item number 63, AE.

3 MR. SCHIAVO: This is consideration of a  
4 request to change the base year to 1999, and  
5 consideration of the 1997-1998 biennial review findings,  
6 and consideration of completion of compliance order for  
7 the city of Clearlake, Lake County.

8 And Betty Fernandez will be making this  
9 presentation.

10 MS. FERNANDEZ: Chairman Jones, members of the  
11 committee.

12 The city originally submitted a base year  
13 change request with a diversion rate of 24 percent. In  
14 this study submitted by the city, diversion data was not  
15 extrapolated.

16 As part of the base year study review, staff  
17 Board conducted a detailed site visit. Board staff  
18 recommended deductions and additions can be viewed in  
19 their entirety by referring to attachment three of the  
20 agenda item packet.

21 As a result of deductions and additions, Board  
22 staff recommends a revised diversion rate of 25 percent  
23 for the base year of 1999.

24 Since the spring of 1999, the city has  
25 implemented a pilot residential curbside green waste

1 collection program that has subsequently been extended  
2 to the current time period. This program continues to  
3 enhance existing programs, and has been ongoing for  
4 approximately two years.

5 With the new program, the city's diversion rate  
6 continues to increase. The diversion rate for 2000 with  
7 the new proposed generation amount would calculate to be  
8 42 percent.

9 Board staff has determined that the information  
10 is adequately documented.

11 Based on this information, Board staff is  
12 recommending option two of the agenda item which would  
13 approve the revised new base year with staff  
14 recommendations, accept the 1997-'98 biennial review  
15 findings, and end the compliance order for the city.

16 Representatives from the city are present to  
17 address any questions.

18 And this concludes my presentation.

19 COMMITTEE CHAIR JONES: Any questions?

20 I have one. Is Jamie, Janie Lowe or Jeanine  
21 Lowe here?

22 MS. LOWE: Jeanine.

23 COMMITTEE CHAIR JONES: You're an employee of  
24 the city?

25 MS. LOWE: Yes.

1 COMMITTEE CHAIR JONES: That's fine. That's  
2 fine. This is a good base year by an employee of a  
3 city, you know. We get a lot of 'em that are, that come  
4 up here that are by people that make their living making  
5 these things and we find huge discrepancies.

6 Your discrepancies were actually where our  
7 staff found you more diversion, and that's a good  
8 things.

9 But congratulations on a good project and  
10 congratulations to staff for helping 'em find that other  
11 diversion.

12 But I'm serious, we get stuff up here where  
13 we'd discounting 60 and 70,000 tons of unaccountable  
14 diversion, so we appreciate the effort.

15 MS. LOWE: Thank you.

16 COMMITTEE CHAIR JONES: Mr. Medina.

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER MEDINA: Chair Jones, I'd like  
18 to move Resolution 2002-249, approval of the request to  
19 change the base year to 1999 for the previously approved  
20 source reduction and recycling element, consideration of  
21 the 1997-1998 biennial review findings for the source  
22 reduction and recycling element and the household  
23 hazardous waste element, and consideration of completion  
24 of compliance order IWMA BR99-41 for the city Clearlake,  
25 Lake County.

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER EATON: Second.

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: Second.

3 COMMITTEE CHAIR JONES: We've got a motion.

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER EATON: Third.

5 COMMITTEE CHAIR JONES: We have a motion, a  
6 second, and a third for approval.

7 Substitute the previous roll, I guess, and put  
8 it on consent?

9 Thank you. Very much.

10 Item number 64, AF.

11 MR. SCHIAVO: This is consideration of a  
12 request to change the base year to 2000, and  
13 consideration of the 1997-'98 biennial review findings,  
14 and consideration of the completion of compliance order  
15 for the city of La Verne, Los Angeles County.

16 And Zane Poulson will be making this  
17 presentation.

18 MR. POULSON: Good morning, committee members  
19 and Chair.

20 After receiving a compliance order at the  
21 September 21st, 1999 Board meeting, the city completed  
22 and submitted a new waste generation study with the  
23 intent of establishing a more recent and more accurate  
24 base year.

25 Diversion activities quantified by the city

1 include residential curbside commingled collection,  
2 residential curbside green waste collection, buy back  
3 center recycling, grasscycling at public schools and  
4 city property, government composting programs,  
5 government recycling programs, construction and  
6 demolition diversion programs, non-residential source  
7 reduction, and recycling and landfill salvage.

8           The city originally submitted a new base year  
9 request with a diversion rate of 28 percent.

10           As part of the base year study review, Board  
11 staff conducted a detailed site visit. Board staff's  
12 proposed changes can be seen in their entirety in  
13 attachment three.

14           With these changes the diversion rate for 2000  
15 will be 31 percent.

16           Based on this information, Board staff is  
17 recommending option two of the agenda item which would  
18 approve the revised new base year with staff  
19 recommendations, accept the 1997-1998 biennial review  
20 findings, and end the compliance order for the city.

21           Representatives from the city are present to  
22 answer any questions.

23           This concludes staff's presentation. Thank  
24 you.

25           COMMITTEE CHAIR JONES: There's another one

1 where our staff added some tonnage. It's amazing that  
2 we only get hammered when we deny tonnage.

3 Mr. Medina.

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER MEDINA: I'd like to move  
5 Resolution 2002-262, option two, accepting Board staff's  
6 revised base year change recommendations, accept the  
7 '97-'98 SRRE and HHWE biennial review findings, and end  
8 the compliance order.

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: I'll  
10 second.

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER EATON: Second.

12 COMMITTEE CHAIR JONES: And a second and a  
13 third. We will --

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER EATON: You see, Mr. Jones,  
15 like yesterday, you know, when it comes to oil and being  
16 slick like that we're always very supportive of the  
17 do-it-yourselfers.

18 COMMITTEE CHAIR JONES: Absolutely.  
19 Absolutely.

20 We have a motion to concur in the second and a  
21 third.

22 Substitute the previous roll and put it on  
23 consent?

24 So ordered.

25 Item number 65, AG, city of Duarte.

1           MR. SCHIAVO: This is consideration of a  
2 request to change the base year to 1998, consideration  
3 of the 1997-'98 biennial review findings, and completion  
4 of compliance order for the city of Duarte, Los Angeles  
5 County.

6           And Zane will be making this presentation.

7           MR. POULSON: After receiving the compliance  
8 order at the September 21st, 1999 Board meeting, the  
9 city completed a new waste generation study with the  
10 intent of establishing a more recent and more accurate  
11 base year.

12           Diversion activities quantified by the city  
13 include residential curbside commingled collection,  
14 residential curbside green waste collection, buy back  
15 center recycling, commercial on-site collection of green  
16 waste and recyclable materials, non-residential source  
17 reduction and recycling, alternative daily cover, and  
18 annual salvage.

19           The city originally submitted a new base year  
20 request with a diversion rate of 27 percent.

21           As part of the base year study review, Board  
22 staff conducted a detailed site visit. Board staff's  
23 proposed changes can be seen in their entirety in  
24 attachment three.

25           With these changes the city's diversion rate

1 for 1998 would be 25 percent.

2 Based on this information, Board staff is  
3 recommending option two of the agenda item which would  
4 approve the revised new base year with staff  
5 recommendations, accept the 1997-1998 biennial review  
6 findings, and end the compliance order for the city.

7 A representative from the city is here to  
8 answer any questions.

9 This concludes my presentation.

10 COMMITTEE CHAIR JONES: Questions, members?

11 Mr. Medina.

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER MEDINA: Yes, I'd like to move  
13 Resolution 2002-261, option two, approve Board staff's  
14 revised base year change recommendations, accept the  
15 '97-'98 SRRE and HHWE biennial review findings, and end  
16 the compliance order.

17 And thank you for not calling it the city of  
18 "Dwart."

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER EATON: Second.

20 COMMITTEE CHAIR JONES: I can speak a little  
21 bit. And a second from Mr. Eaton.

22 We've got a motion by Mr. Medina, a second by  
23 Mr. Eaton.

24 Substitute the previous roll? Put it on  
25 consent?

1           So ordered.

2           We have item number 37 which is the last item.

3           MR. SCHIAVO: Item number 37 is a status  
4 update on the grants awarded under the 1999-2000 state  
5 agency and large state facility waste diversion  
6 recycling grant program.

7           And this will be presented by Jim Cropper.

8           COMMITTEE CHAIR JONES: While you guys are  
9 getting set up, for the people that finished that last  
10 section, thank you very much, good work, we appreciate  
11 it.

12          Go ahead.

13          MR. CROPPER: Good morning, my name is Jim  
14 Cropper, I'm with the state local assistance branch.  
15 And this is a presentation on the fiscal year 1999-2000  
16 state agency and large state facility waste diversion  
17 and recycling grants.

18          There's a Power Point presentation, I don't  
19 know if you have it on the screen in front of you,  
20 anyway it's behind you.

21          The purpose of my presentation is to update the  
22 committee on the status of grants provided for state  
23 agencies and large state facilities.

24          I would like to start by providing a little bit  
25 of background on these grants.

1           The grants were approved in October, 1999, and  
2 were for a total of \$550,000 to provide 22, \$25,000  
3 grants for state agencies and large state facilities.

4           And the purpose of the grants was to:

5           Help integrate -- I'm sorry -- help implement  
6 the integrated waste management plans that are required  
7 by AB 75;

8           Purchase waste diversion equipment to approve  
9 the diversion programs at state facilities;

10          Purchase recycling containers and processing  
11 equipment;

12          And develop cooperative programs between state  
13 and local government for diversion programs.

14          I forgot about my Power Point presentation.

15          The results of the grant program was that we  
16 spent, so far we've spent about \$415,000, and the  
17 difference between that and the 550,000 is because not  
18 all of them were for \$25,000.

19          And in addition we have, we gave the Resources  
20 Agency an extension until the end of the year, and that  
21 one was for \$25,000.

22          And then there were also two others from De  
23 Anza College and Foothill College in which we haven't  
24 received their grant payment request. So that's about  
25 \$75,000 right there.

1           In addition the, we provided about 25 grants.  
2 We expected to have about 22 grants, so we have spent  
3 less money and we have more, and we're able to provide  
4 more grants to the state facilities.

5           The state facilities provided more than  
6 \$400,000 in matching funds. Many of them were for more  
7 than \$25,000.

8           There was one for San Jose State that they  
9 expected matching funds of about a hundred thousand  
10 dollars.

11           We provided, like I said, 25 grants to 11  
12 community colleges, six California state universities,  
13 five fairs and a developmental center, one state agency  
14 facility, the Resources Agency, and one prison.

15           And we purchased some of the following  
16 equipment. And I'll show you pictures of the examples  
17 of some of the things that we purchased.

18           This is at the Allan A-L-L-A-N Hancock  
19 Community College near Santa Maria. And you can see  
20 that they purchased two mulching mowers.

21           At El Camino College they were so happy with  
22 the mulching mower that they got through this grant that  
23 they went and bought another one, so they've, you know,  
24 they're able to save on labor, they're able to save on  
25 diversion, and they're extremely happy with it.

1           And at the Allan Hancock Community College they  
2 expected to be able to divert about 288 tons of grass,  
3 or 28 percent of their waste stream.

4           At, one of the other things that was purchased  
5 was a front end loader, and this is at Redwood Acres, a  
6 county fair in Eureka.

7           And what they do with the front end loader is  
8 people come in with their pickup trucks and they shovel  
9 horse manure into people's pickup trucks that they're  
10 able to use on their vegetable gardens or on their lawn  
11 or whatever. So anyway, so they're able to divert the  
12 materials that way.

13           This is one of the, kind of the most, I think  
14 one of the most interesting projects was a food  
15 composter at Humboldt State. And they use  
16 vermicomposting. And it's always been kind of an issue  
17 at Humboldt State what to do with their food waste, and  
18 so they were able to divert about fifteen tons per year  
19 of food waste.

20           And the structure that is used for the food  
21 composter is made out of sustainable materials. It's  
22 made out of bamboo that they've poured concrete into.

23           And then also the pulverizer that pulverizes  
24 the materials, they got, it's kind of a reuse that they  
25 got from UC Berkeley, and then they, the road that goes

1 up to this facility is made with rubber modified  
2 asphalt. So, you know, it's kind of all aspects of  
3 diversion and reuse and recycling.

4 One of the big, one of many, many of the types  
5 of equipment that were purchased were for balers, and  
6 that helps them to market their materials better and get  
7 a better price for their recyclables, and then able to  
8 put that money back into their programs.

9 This is at Grossmont College near San Diego,  
10 and it helps them divert about twenty tons of cardboard  
11 a year.

12 And this is a chipper. We purchased three  
13 chippers. And at Cal Poly San Luis Obispo that will  
14 help them divert about 140 tons per year, or 35 percent  
15 of their waste stream. So it's really going to be  
16 helpful to their program.

17 At some of the facilities they needed a storage  
18 shed for some of their equipment, some of their  
19 recycling equipment, and so anyway they purchased  
20 storage sheds.

21 One was at Siskiyou College, and so obviously  
22 they have a lot of problems with snow and so this will  
23 help them out.

24 We purchased five trucks. And this is at, I  
25 think this is at Sonoma State, but we also purchased at

1 Sonoma Developmental Center which was the, a best  
2 example of a cooperative program.

3           They'll be able to use their truck to not only  
4 take their materials to a recycling center, but they'll  
5 be able to pick up from local government and also be  
6 able to pick up from businesses. And then they'll take  
7 the material and their clients will be able to, with  
8 like newspaper, make some of the newspaper logs and also  
9 be able to provide it to florists.

10           We also, we also purchased some hand dryers for  
11 Grossmont College.

12           And one of the big things we purchased were the  
13 Desk-side recycling containers. And this really helps  
14 them out, helps their programs out where they just  
15 didn't have the money to purchase desk-side recycling  
16 containers, and so this really gets their program going.

17           We purchased 624 indoor recycling containers.  
18 And also, as it says here, 111 outdoor recycling  
19 containers.

20           This is at Santa Rosa Junior College. And  
21 anyway, this is going to tremendously help their program  
22 out. Not only are they going to use it at that  
23 facility, but they'll be also be able to use it at their  
24 other site in Petaluma.

25           And we wanted to give you some examples of how

1 these grants are helping the, helping implement the  
2 individual integrated waste management plans.

3 At Sac State they determined that one of their  
4 needs were to improve their white office recycling  
5 paper, recycling in their dorms, and get their cardboard  
6 from individual buildings out to their recycling center.

7 And they have their shipping and delivery done  
8 to individual buildings, and so the cardboard ends up at  
9 the individual buildings, and so they needed to get it  
10 from there out to the recycling center.

11 And so they purchased not only desk-side  
12 recycling containers, inside recycling containers, and  
13 towable bins that they'll be able to tow out to the  
14 recycling center.

15 And as kind of a funny aside, they have to go  
16 down a Main Street down to the recycling center and they  
17 had like triangles, the reflective triangles, but the  
18 state police wanted them to put lights on the back of  
19 these towable recycling bins as if someone were going to  
20 run into it. I don't know. This is going to help their  
21 diversion program from about 37 percent to an increase  
22 from 37 percent to 48 percent.

23 And another example was at L.A. Trade and Tech  
24 Community College. And the same type of thing where  
25 they needed to improve their office paper recycling, and

1 then also they needed to be able to chip brush for  
2 mulch.

3 And this, the grant that we provided them will  
4 be able to improve their recycling program from 35  
5 percent up to 42 percent.

6 So in summary, with this grant money we're able  
7 to purchase 24 pieces of heavy equipment, 6,000  
8 recycling containers, 29 hand dryers, and three storage  
9 sheds.

10 And the grants have been an excellent tool to  
11 help the state facilities implement their integrated  
12 waste management plans.

13 And despite spending this large amount of  
14 money, we still continue to get requests for grant, for  
15 more grant money.

16 And in addition, this grant money was not only  
17 helpful in diverting tons of material from the waste  
18 stream, but I think that it also provided tons of  
19 goodwill to the state facilities so that they could  
20 implement their programs.

21 And if you have any questions, I'd be happy to  
22 answer them.

23 COMMITTEE CHAIR JONES: Any questions from the  
24 members?

25 All right. Thank you very much and

1 congratulations.

2 Is that your last item, Mr. Schiavo?

3 MR. SCHIAVO: Yes.

4 COMMITTEE CHAIR JONES: Does anybody from the  
5 public wish to address the committee?

6 All right. We're done. Thank you all,  
7 appreciate it.

8 (Thereupon the foregoing was concluded at  
9 11:50 a.m.)

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

## 1 CERTIFICATE OF CERTIFIED SHORTHAND REPORTER

2

3 I, DORIS M. BAILEY, a Certified Shorthand  
4 Reporter and Registered Professional Reporter, in and  
5 for the State of California, do hereby certify that I am  
6 a disinterested person herein; that I reported the  
7 foregoing proceedings in shorthand writing; and  
8 thereafter caused my shorthand writing to be transcribed  
9 by computer.

10 I further certify that I am not of counsel or  
11 attorney for any of the parties to said proceedings, nor  
12 in any way interested in the outcome of said  
13 proceedings.

14 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand  
15 as a Certified Shorthand Reporter and Registered  
16 Professional Reporter on the 21st day of May, 2002.

17

18

19

Doris M. Bailey, CSR, RPR, CRR

20 Certified Shorthand Reporter

License Number 8751

21

22

23

24

25